arXiv:1603.07320v1 [math.PR] 23 Mar 2016

UNIFORM SPANNING FORESTS OF PLANAR GRAPHS

TOM HUTCHCROFT AND ASAF NACHMIAS

Abstract. We prove that the free uniform spanning forest of any bounded degree, proper plane graph is connected almost surely, answering a question of Benjamini, Lyons, Peres and Schramm [9]. We provide a quantitative form of this result, calculating the critical exponents governing the geometry of the uniform spanning forests of transient proper plane graphs with bounded degrees and codegrees. We find that these exponents are universal in this class of graphs, provided that measurements are made using the hyperbolic geometry of their circle packings rather than their usual combinatorial geometry.

Lastly, we extend the connectivity result to bounded degree planar graphs that admit locally finite drawings in countably connected domains, but show that the result cannot be extended to general bounded degree planar graphs.

1 Introduction

The **uniform spanning forests** (USFs) of an infinite, locally finite, connected graph G are defined as weak limits of uniform spanning trees of finite subgraphs of G. These limits can be taken with either **free** or **wired** boundary conditions, yielding the **free uniform spanning forest (FUSF)** and the **wired uniform spanning forest (WUSF)** respectively. Although the USFs are defined as limits of random spanning trees, they need not be connected. Indeed, a principal result of Pemantle [47] is that the WUSF and FUSF of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ coincide, and that they are almost surely (a.s.) a single tree if and only if $d \leq 4$. Benjamini, Lyons, Peres and Schramm [9] (henceforth referred to as BLPS) later gave a complete characterisation of connectivity of the WUSF, proving that the WUSF of a graph is connected a.s. if and only if two independent random walks on the graph intersect a.s. [9, Theorem 9.2].

The FUSF is much less understood. No characterisation of its connectivity is known, nor has it been proven that connectivity is a zero-one event. One class of graphs in which the FUSF is relatively well understood are the *proper plane graphs*. Recall that a **planar graph** is a graph that can be embedded in the plane, while a **plane graph** is a planar graph G together with a specified embedding of G in the plane (or some other topological disc). A plane graph is **proper** if the embedding is proper, meaning that every compact subset of the plane (or whatever topological disc G was embedded in) intersects at most finitely many edges and vertices of the drawing (see Section 2.4 for further details). For example, every tree can be drawn in the plane without accumulation points, while the product of $\mathbb{Z}$ with a finite cycle is planar but cannot be drawn in the plane without accumulation points (and therefore has no proper embedding in the plane).

Date: March 24, 2016.

BLPS proved that the free and wired uniform spanning forests are distinct whenever G is a transient proper plane graph with bounded degrees, and asked [9, Question 15.2] whether the FUSF is a.s. connected in this class of graphs. They proved that this is indeed the case when G is a self-dual plane Cayley graph that is rough-isometric to the hyperbolic plane [9, Theorem 12.7]. These hypotheses were later weakened by Lyons, Morris and Schramm [42, Theorem 7.5], who proved that the FUSF of any bounded degree proper plane graph that is rough-isometric to the hyperbolic plane is a.s. connected.

Our first result provides a complete answer to [9, Question 15.2], obtaining optimal hypotheses under which the FUSF of a proper plane graph is a.s. connected. The techniques we developed to answer this question also allow us to prove quantitative versions of this result, which we describe in the next section. We state our result in the natural generality of proper plane networks. Recall that a **network** (G, c) is a locally finite, connected graph $G = (V, E)$ together with a function $c : E \to (0, \infty)$ assigning a positive **conductance** to each edge of G. The **resistance** of an edge e in a network (G, c) is defined to be $1/c(e)$. Graphs may be considered as networks by setting $c \equiv 1$. A **plane network** is a planar graph G together with specified conductances and a specified drawing of G in the plane.

Theorem 1.1. *The free uniform spanning forest is almost surely connected in any bounded degree proper plane network with edge conductances bounded above.*

In light of the duality between the free and wired uniform spanning forests of proper plane graphs (see Section 2.4.1), the FUSF of a proper plane graph G with locally finite dual $G^\dagger$ is connected a.s. if and only if every component of the WUSF of $G^\dagger$ is a.s. *one-ended*. Thus, Theorem 1.1 follows easily from the dual statement Theorem 1.2 below. (The implication is immediate when the dual graph is locally finite.) Recall that an infinite graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be **one-ended** if, for every finite set $K \subset V$, the subgraph induced by $V \setminus K$ has exactly one infinite connected component. In particular, an infinite tree is one-ended if and only if it does not contain a simple bi-infinite path. Components of the WUSF are known to be one-ended a.s. in several other classes of graphs [2, 9, 27, 28, 42, 47], and are recurrent in any graph [46]. Recall that a plane graph G is said to have **bounded codegree** if its faces have a bounded number of sides, or, equivalently, if its dual $G^\dagger$ has bounded degrees.

Theorem 1.2. *Every component of the wired uniform spanning forest is one-ended almost surely in any bounded codegree proper plane network with edge resistances bounded above.*

The uniform spanning trees of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and other two dimensional Euclidean lattices are very well understood due to the deep theory of conformally invariant scaling limits. The study of the UST on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ led Schramm, in his seminal paper [52], to introduce the SLE processes, which he conjectured to describe the scaling limits of the loop-erased random walk and UST. This conjecture that was subsequently proven in the celebrated work of Lawler, Werner and Schramm [38]. Overall, Schramm's introduction of SLE has revolutionised the understanding of statistical physics in two dimensions; see e.g. [18, 36, 50] for guides to the extensive literature in this very active field.

Although our own setting is too general to apply this theory, we nevertheless keep conformal invariance in mind throughout this paper. Indeed, the key to our proofs is *circle packing*, a canonical method of drawing planar graphs that is closely related to conformal mapping (see e.g. [25, 26, 49, 50, 57] and references therein). For many purposes, one can

pretend that the random walk on the packing is a quasiconformal image of standard planar Brownian motion: Effective resistances, heat kernels, and harmonic measures on the graph can each be estimated in terms of the corresponding Brownian quantities [4, 15].

1.1 Universal USF exponents via circle packing

A **circle packing** P is a set of discs in the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$ that have disjoint interiors (i.e., do not overlap) but can be tangent. The **tangency graph** $G = G(P)$ of a circle packing P is the plane graph with the centres of the circles in P as its vertices and with edges given by straight lines between the centres of tangent circles. The Koebe-Andreev-Thurston Circle Packing Theorem [34, 43, 58] states that every *finite*, simple planar graph arises as the tangency graph of a circle packing, and that if the graph is a triangulation then its circle packing is unique up to Möbius transformations and reflections (see [13] for a combinatorial proof). The Circle Packing Theorem was extended to infinite plane triangulations by He and Schramm [24, 25], who proved that every *infinite, proper*, simple plane triangulation admits a locally finite circle packing in either the Euclidean plane or the hyperbolic plane (identified with the interior of the unit disc), but not both. We call an infinite, simple, proper plane triangulation **CP parabolic** if it admits a circle packing in the plane and **CP hyperbolic** otherwise.

He and Schramm [24] also initiated the use of circle packing to study probabilistic questions on plane graphs. In particular, they showed that a bounded degree, simple, proper plane triangulation is CP parabolic if and only if simple random walk on the triangulation is recurrent (i.e., visits every vertex infinitely often a.s.). Circle packing has since proven instrumental in the study of planar graphs, and random walks on planar graphs in particular. Most relevantly to us, circle packing was used by Benjamini and Schramm [10] to prove that every transient, bounded degree planar graph admits non-constant harmonic Dirichlet functions; BLPS [9] later applied this result to deduce that the free and wired uniform spanning forest of a bounded degree plane graph coincide if and only if the graph is recurrent. We refer the reader to [57] and [50] for background on circle packing, and to [4–6, 10, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 29, 31] for further probabilistic applications.

A guiding principle of the works mentioned above is that circle packing endows a triangulation with a geometry that, for many purposes, is better than the usual graph metric. The results described in this section provide a compelling instance of this principle in action: we find that the critical exponents governing the geometry of the USFs are universal over all transient, bounded degree, proper plane triangulations, provided that measurements are made using the hyperbolic geometry of their circle packings rather than the usual combinatorial geometry of the graphs. It is crucial here that we use the circle packing to take our measurements: The exponents in the graph distance are not universal and need not even exist (see Figure 2). In Remark 6.1 we give an example to show that no such universal exponents hold in the CP parabolic case at this level of generality.

In order to state the quantitative versions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in their full generality, we first introduce **double circle packing**. Let G be a plane graph with vertex set V and face set F. A double circle packing of G is a pair of circle packings $P = \{P(v) : v \in V\}$ and $P^\dagger = \{P^\dagger(f) : f \in F\}$ satisfying the following conditions (see Figure 1):



FIGURE 1. A simple, 3-connected, finite plane graph (left) and its double circle packing (right). Primal circles are filled and have solid boundaries, dual circles have dashed boundaries.

(1) (G **is the tangency graph of** P.) For each pair of vertices u and v of G, the discs $P(u)$ and $P(v)$ are tangent if and only if u and v are adjacent in G.
(2) ($G^\dagger$ **is the tangency graph of** $P^\dagger$.) For each pair of faces f and g of G, the discs $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(g)$ are tangent if and only if f and g are adjacent in $G^\dagger$.
(3) (**Primal and dual circles are perpendicular**.) For each vertex v and face f of G, the discs $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P(v)$ have non-empty intersection if and only if f is incident to v, and in this case the boundary circles of $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P(v)$ intersect at right angles.

It is easily seen that any finite plane graph admitting a double circle packing must be simple (i.e., not containing any loops or multiple edges) and 3-connected (meaning that the subgraph induced by $V \setminus \{u, v\}$ is connected for each $u, v \in V$). Conversely, Thurston's interpretation of Andreev's Theorem [43, 58] implies that every finite, simple, 3-connected plane graph admits a double circle packing (see also [13]). The corresponding infinite theory was given developed by He [23], who proved that every infinite, simple, 3-connected, proper plane graph G with locally finite dual admits a double circle packing in either the Euclidean plane or the hyperbolic plane (but not both) and that this packing is unique up to Möbius transformations and reflections. As before, we say that G is CP parabolic or CP hyperbolic as appropriate. As in the He-Schramm Theorem [24], CP hyperbolicity is equivalent to transience for graphs with bounded degrees and codegrees [23].

Let G be CP hyperbolic and let $(P, P^\dagger)$ be a double circle packing of G in the hyperbolic plane. We write $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$ for the hyperbolic radius of the circle $P(v)$. For each subset $A \subset V(G)$, we define $\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(A)$ to be the hyperbolic diameter of the set of hyperbolic centres of the circles in P corresponding to vertices in A, and define $\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(A)$ to be the hyperbolic area of the union of the circles in P corresponding to vertices in A. Since $(P, P^\dagger)$ is unique up to isometries of the hyperbolic plane, $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$, $\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(A)$, and $\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(A)$ do not depend on the choice of $(P, P^\dagger)$.

We say that a network G has **bounded local geometry** if there exists a constant M such that $\deg(v) \le M$ for every vertex v of G and $M^{-1} \le c(e) \le M$ for every edge e of G. Given a plane network G, we let F be the set of faces of G, and define

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_G = \max\Big\{ \sup_{v \in V} \deg(v),\ \sup_{f \in F} \deg(f),\ \sup_{e \in E} c(e),\ \sup_{e \in E} c(e)^{-1} \Big\}.$$



FIGURE 2. Two bounded degree, simple, proper plane triangulations for which the graph distance is not comparable to the hyperbolic distance. Similar examples are given in [57, Figure 17.7]. Left: In this example, rings of degree seven vertices (grey) are separated by growing bands of degree six vertices (white), causing the hyperbolic radii of circles to decay. The bands of degree six vertices can grow surprisingly quickly without the triangulation becoming recurrent [54]. Right: In this example, half-spaces of the 8-regular (grey) and 6-regular (white) triangulations have been glued together along their boundaries; the circles corresponding to the 6-regular half-space are contained inside a horodisc and have decaying hyperbolic radii.

Given a spanning tree $\mathfrak{F}$ and two vertices x and y in G, we write $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)$ for the unique path in $\mathfrak{F}$ connecting x and y.

Theorem 1.3 (Free diameter exponent)**.** *Let G be a transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with $\mathbf{M}_G < \infty$, let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the free uniform spanning forest of G, and let $e = (x,y)$ be an edge of G. Then there exist positive constants $k_1 = k_1(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$, increasing in $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, and $k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{M})$ such that*

$$k_1 R^{-1} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)) \geq R\right) \leq k_2 R^{-1}$$

for every $R \geq 1$.

Given a spanning forest $\mathfrak{F}$ of G in which every component is a one-ended tree and an edge e of G, the **past** of e in $\mathfrak{F}$, denoted $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)$, is defined to be the unique finite connected component of $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$ if $e \in \mathfrak{F}$ and to be the empty set otherwise. The following theorem is equivalent to Theorem 1.3 by duality (see Sections 2.4.1 and 4.6).

Theorem 1.4 (Wired diameter exponent)**.** *Let G be a transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with $\mathbf{M}_G < \infty$, let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the wired uniform spanning forest of G, and let $e = (x,y)$ be an edge of G. Then there exist positive constants $k_1 = k_1(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$, increasing in $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, and $k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{M})$ such that*

$$k_1 R^{-1} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R\right) \leq k_2 R^{-1}$$

for every $R \geq 1$.

By similar methods, we are also able to obtain a universal exponent of $1/2$ for the tail of the area of $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)$, where $\mathfrak{F}$ is the WUSF of G.

Theorem 1.5 (Wired area exponent)**.** *Let G be a transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with $\mathbf{M}_G < \infty$, let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the wired uniform spanning forest of G, and let $e = (x, y)$ be an edge of G. Then there exist positive constants $k_1 = k_1(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$, increasing in $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, and $k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{M})$ such that*

$$k_1 R^{-1/2} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R\right) \leq k_2 R^{-1/2}$$

for every $R \geq 1$.

The exponents 1 and $1/2$ occurring in Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 should, respectively, be compared with the analogous exponents for the survival time and total progeny of a critical branching process whose offspring distribution has finite variance (see e.g. [40, § 5,12]).

For *uniformly transient* proper plane graphs (that is, proper plane graphs in which the escape probabilities of the random walk are bounded uniformly away from zero), the hyperbolic radii of circles in $(P, P^\dagger)$ are bounded away from zero uniformly (Proposition 4.16). This implies that the hyperbolic metric and the graph metric are rough-isometric (Corollary 4.17). Consequently, Theorems 1.3–1.5 hold with the graph distance and counting measure appropriately (Corollary 4.18). This yields the following appealing corollary, which applies, for example, to planar Cayley graphs of co-compact Fuchsian groups.

Corollary 1.6 (Free length exponent)**.** *Let G be a uniformly transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with $\mathbf{M}_G < \infty$ and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the free uniform spanning forest of G. Let $\mathbf{p} > 0$ be a uniform lower bound on the escape probabilities of G. Then there exist positive constants $k_1 = k_1(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ and $k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ such that*

$$k_1 R^{-1/2} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)| \geq R\right) \leq k_2 R^{-1/2}$$

for every edge $e = (x, y)$ of G and every $R \geq 1$.

See [8, 12, 32, 42, 44, 53] and the survey [7] for related results on Euclidean lattices.

1.2 Multiply-connected plane networks

It is natural to ask whether Theorem 1.1 extends to *all* bounded degree planar graphs, rather than just those admitting proper embeddings into the plane. Indeed, if such an extension were true, it would have interesting consequences for finite planar graphs. In Section 5.5 we give an example, which was analyzed in collaboration with Gady Kozma, to show that the theorem does not admit such an extension.

Theorem 1.7. *There exists a bounded degree planar graph G such that the free uniform spanning forest of G is disconnected with positive probability.*

In light of this example, it is an interesting problem to determine for which bounded degree planar graphs the FUSF is connected. The final result of this paper makes some progress towards understanding this problem. (See Section 2.4 for precise definitions of proper embeddings of graphs into domains.)



FIGURE 3. Left: A circle packing in the multiply-connected circle domain $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. Right: A circle packing in a circle domain domain with several boundary components.

Theorem 1.8. *Let G be a bounded degree planar network that admits a proper embedding into a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ with countably many boundary components. Then the free uniform spanning forest of G is almost surely connected.*

We conjecture (Conjecture 6.3) that the connectivity of the FUSF of a simple, bounded degree triangulation is a property of the carrier of the triangulation's circle packing.

The proof of Theorem 1.8 requires two additional ingredients besides those appearing in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The first is the introduction of the *transboundary uniform spanning forest* (TUSF), which is dual to the FUSF of a (not necessarily proper) plane graph in the same way that the WUSF is dual to the FUSF of a proper plane graph. This allows us to formulate Theorem 5.4, which is dual to Theorem 1.8 in the same way that Theorem 1.2 is dual to Theorem 1.1. The second additional ingredient, which we use to prove this dual statement, is a transfinite induction inspired by He and Schramm's work on the Koebe Conjecture [25, 51].

Organisation

Section 2 contains definitions and background on those notions that will be used throughout the paper. Experienced readers are advised that this section also includes proofs of a few simple folklore-type lemmas and propositions. Section 3 contains the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, as well as the upper bound of Theorem 1.4 in the case that G is a triangulation. Section 4 completes the proofs of Theorems 1.3–1.5 and Corollary 1.6; the most substantial component of this section is the proof of the lower bound of Theorem 1.4. In Section 5, we define the transboundary uniform spanning forest and prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.8. We conclude with some remarks and open problems in Section 6.

2 Background and definitions

2.1 Notation

We write $E^{\rightarrow}$ for the set of oriented edges of a network $G = (V, E)$. An oriented edge $e \in E^{\rightarrow}$ is oriented from its tail e^- to its head e^+, and has reversal $-e$. For each $r', r > 0$, and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we define the ball

$$B_z(r) = \{z' \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z'| < r\}$$

and the annulus

$$A_z(r, r') = \{z' \in \mathbb{C} : r \leq |z' - z| \leq r'\}.$$

We write $d_{\mathbb{C}}$ for the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{C}$ and write $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ for the hyperbolic metric on $\mathbb{D}$.

2.2 Uniform Spanning Forests

We begin with a succinct review of some basic facts about USFs, referring the reader to [9] and Chapters 4 and 10 of [40] for a comprehensive overview. For each finite, connected graph G, we define UST_G to be the uniform measure on the set of spanning trees of G (i.e., connected subgraphs of G containing every vertex and no cycles). More generally, for a finite network $G = (G, w)$, we define UST_G to be the probability measure on spanning trees of G for which the measure of each tree is proportional to the product of the conductances of the edges in the tree.

An **exhaustion** of an infinite network G is a sequence $\langle V_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ of finite, connected subsets of V such that $V_n \subseteq V_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $\cup_n V_n = V$. Given such an exhaustion, let the network G_n be the subgraph of G induced by V_n together with the conductances inherited from G. The **free uniform spanning forest** measure FUSF_G is defined to be the weak limit of the sequence $\langle \mathsf{UST}_{G_n} \rangle_{n \geq 1}$, so that

$$\mathsf{FUSF}_G(S \subset \mathfrak{F}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{UST}_{G_n}(S \subset T).$$

for each finite set $S \subset E$. For each n, we also construct a network G_n^* from G by gluing (wiring) every vertex of $G \setminus G_n$ into a single vertex, denoted ∂_n, and deleting all the self-loops that are created. We identify the set of edges of G_n^* with the set of edges of G that have at least one endpoint in V_n. The **wired uniform spanning forest** measure WUSF_G is defined to be the weak limit of the sequence $\langle \mathsf{UST}_{G_n^*} \rangle_{n \geq 1}$, so that

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(S \subset \mathfrak{F}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{UST}_{G_n^*}(S \subset T)$$

for each finite set $S \subset E$. These weak limits were both implicitly proven to exist by Pemantle [47], although the WUSF was not considered explicitly until the work of Häggström [21]. Both measures are easily seen to be concentrated on the set of **essential spanning forests** of G, that is, cycle-free subgraphs of G including every vertex such that every connected component is infinite. The measure FUSF_G stochastically dominates WUSF_G for every infinite network G.

2.2.1 The Spatial Markov Property

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite or infinite network and let A and B be subsets of E. We write $(G - B)/A$ for the (possibly disconnected) network formed from G by deleting every edge in B and contracting (i.e., identifying the two endpoints of) every edge in A. We identify the edges of $(G - B)/A$ with $E \setminus B$. Suppose that G is finite and that

$$\mathsf{UST}_G(A \subseteq T, B \cap T = \emptyset) > 0.$$

Then, given the event that T contains every edge in A and none of the edges in B, the conditional distribution of T is equal to the union of A and the UST of $(G - B)/A$. That is, for every event $\mathscr{A} \subseteq \{0,1\}^E$,

$$\mathsf{UST}_G(T \in \mathscr{A} \mid A \subset T,\, B \cap T = \emptyset) = \mathsf{UST}_{(G-B)/A}(T \cup A \in \mathscr{A}).$$

This is the **spatial Markov property** of the UST. Taking limits over exhaustions, we obtain a corresponding spatial Markov property for the USFs: If $G = (V, E)$ is an infinite network and A and B are subsets of E such that

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(A \subseteq \mathfrak{F}, B \cap \mathfrak{F} = \emptyset) > 0$$

and the network $(G - B)/A$ is locally finite, then

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid A \subset \mathfrak{F},\, B \cap \mathfrak{F} = \emptyset) = \mathsf{WUSF}_{(G-B)/A}(\mathfrak{F} \cup A \in \mathscr{A}). \tag{2.1}$$

(If $(G - B)/A$ is not connected, we define $\mathsf{WUSF}_{(G-B)/A}$ to be the product of the WUSF measures on the connected components of $(G-B)/A$.) A similar spatial Markov property holds for the FUSF.

The UST and USFs also enjoy a *strong* form of the spatial Markov property. Let G be a finite or infinite network, and let $K : \{0,1\}^E \to \{0,1\}^E$ be a Borel function from the set of subgraphs of G to itself. We say that K is a **local set** if for every set $W \subseteq E$, the event $\{K \subseteq W\}$ is measurable with respect to the σ-algebra generated by $\{0,1\}^W$. Given a local set K, let $\mathcal{F}_K$ be the sub-σ-algebra of the Borel σ-algebra of $\{0,1\}^E$ generated by K and $\{0,1\}^K$. Given $\omega \in \{0,1\}^E$ and a local set K, let $K_o(\omega) = K(\omega) \cap \omega$ be the set of edges in $K(\omega)$ that are open in ω, and let $K_c(\omega) = K(\omega) \setminus K_o(\omega)$ be the set of edges of K that are closed in ω.

Proposition 2.1 (Strong Spatial Markov Property for the USFs)**.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite network and let K be a local set such that for every $\omega \in \{0,1\}^E$, the set $K(\omega)$ is either finite or equal to all of E. Then for every event $\mathscr{A} \subseteq \{0,1\}^E$*

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid \mathcal{F}_K) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{WUSF}_{(G-K_c(\mathfrak{F}))/K_o(\mathfrak{F})}(\mathfrak{F} \cup K_o(\mathfrak{F}) \in \mathscr{A}) & K \neq E \\ \mathbb{1}(K_o \in \mathscr{A}) & K = E \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\mathsf{FUSF}_G(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid \mathcal{F}_K) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{FUSF}_{(G-K_c(\mathfrak{F}))/K_o(\mathfrak{F})}(\mathfrak{F} \cup K_o(\mathfrak{F}) \in \mathscr{A}) & K \neq E \\ \mathbb{1}(K_o \in \mathscr{A}) & K = E. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. We prove the first equality, the second is similar. Write $K = K(\mathfrak{F}), K_o = K_o(\mathfrak{F})$, and $K_c = K_c(\mathfrak{F})$. Expand the conditional probability

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{WUSF}_G\left(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid \mathcal{F}_K\right) \mathbb{1}(K \neq E)\\ &\qquad = \sum_{W_1, W_2 \subset E \text{ finite}} \mathsf{WUSF}_G\left(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid K_o = W_1, K_c = W_2\right) \mathbb{1}\left(K_o = W_1, K_c = W_2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since K is a local set, the right-hand side is equal to

$$\sum_{W_1, W_2 \subset E \text{ finite}} \mathsf{WUSF}_G\left(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid W_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}, W_2 \cap \mathfrak{F} = \emptyset\right) \mathbb{1}\left(K_o = W_1, K_c = W_2\right).$$

Applying the spatial Markov property gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{WUSF}_G\left(\mathfrak{F} \in \mathscr{A} \mid \mathcal{F}_K\right) \mathbb{1}(K \neq E)\\ &\qquad = \sum_{W_1, W_2 \subset E \text{ finite}} \mathsf{WUSF}_{(G - W_2)/W_1}\left(\mathfrak{F} \cup W_1 \in \mathscr{A}\right) \mathbb{1}\left(K_o = W_1, K_c = W_2\right)\\ &\qquad = \mathsf{WUSF}_{(G-K_c)/K_o}\left(\mathfrak{F} \cup K_o \in \mathscr{A}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 Random walk, effective resistances

Given a network G and a vertex u of G, we write $\mathbf{P}_u^G$ for the law of the simple random walk on G started at u, and will often write simply $\mathbf{P}_u$ if the choice of network is unambiguous. For each set of vertices A, we let τ_A be the first time the random walk visits A, letting $\tau_A = \infty$ if the walk never visits A. Similarly, τ_A^+ is defined to be the first positive time that the random walk visits A. The conductance $c(u)$ of a vertex u is defined to be the sum of the conductances of the edges emanating from u.

Let A and B be sets of vertices in a finite network G. The **effective conductance** between A and B in G is defined to be

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) = \sum_{v \in A} c(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_B < \tau_A^+),$$

while the effective resistance $\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G)$ is defined to be the reciprocal of the effective conductance, $\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) = \mathscr{C}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G)^{-1}$. Now suppose that G is an infinite network with exhaustion $\langle V_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ and let A and B be finite subsets of V. Let $\langle G_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ and $\langle G_n^* \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ be defined as in Section 2.2. The **free effective resistance between A and B** is defined to be the limit

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{F}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_n),$$

while the **wired effective resistance between A and B** is defined to be

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{W}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_n^*).$$

Free and wired effective conductances are defined by taking reciprocals. The free effective resistance between two, possibly infinite, sets A and B is defined to be the limit of the free effective resistances between $A \cap V_n$ and $B \cap V_n$, which are decreasing in n. We also define

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}\left(A \to B \cup \{\infty\}\right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}\left(A \to B \cup \{\partial_n\}; G_n^*\right).$$

See [40] for further background on electrical networks.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will require the following simple lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let A and B be sets of vertices in an infinite network G. Then*

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B;\, G) \leq 3 \max\left\{\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \to B \cup \{\infty\};\, G),\, \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(B \to A \cup \{\infty\};\, G)\right\}.$$

Proof. Let $M = \max\left\{\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \to B \cup \{\infty\};\, G),\, \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(B \to A \cup \{\infty\};\, G)\right\}$. Recall that for any three sets A, B and C in G^*_n (or any other finite network) [40, Exercise 2.33],

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B \cup C; G^*_n)^{-1} \leq \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G^*_n)^{-1} + \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow C; G^*_n)^{-1}.$$

Letting $C = \{\partial_n\}$ and taking the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$M^{-1} \leq \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B \cup \{\infty\}; G)^{-1} \leq \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G)^{-1} + \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow \infty; G)^{-1}.$$

Rearranging, we have

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \to \infty; G) \leq \frac{M \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G)}{\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) - M}.$$

By symmetry, the inequality continues to hold when we exchange the roles of A and B. Combining both of these inequalities with the triangle inequality for effective resistances [40, Exercise 9.29] yields that

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) \leq \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \to \infty; G) + \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(B \to \infty; G) \leq 2\frac{M \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G)}{\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) - M},$$

which rearranges to give the claimed inequality. □

2.3.1 Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula.

The connection between effective resistances and spanning trees was first discovered by Kirchhoff [33] (see also [14]).

Theorem 2.3 (Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula)**.** *Let G be a finite network. Then for every $e \in E^{\to}$*

$$\mathsf{UST}_G(e \in T) = c(e) \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(e^- \leftrightarrow e^+; G).$$

Taking limits over exhaustions, we also have the following extension of Kirchhoff's formula:

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(e \in \mathfrak{F}) = c(e) \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(e^- \leftrightarrow e^+; G). \tag{2.4}$$

A similar equality holds for the FUSF.

2.3.2 The method of random paths.

We say that a path Γ in a network G is **simple** if it does not visit any vertex more than once. Given a probability measure ν on simple paths in a network G, we define the **energy** of ν to be

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E^{\to}} \frac{1}{c(e)} \big(\nu(e \in \Gamma) - \nu(-e \in \Gamma)\big)^2.$$

Effective resistances can be estimated using random paths as follows (see [40, §3] and [48]). In particular, if G is an infinite network and A and B are two finite sets of vertices in G, then

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B \cup \{\infty\}; G) = \min \left\{ \mathcal{E}(\nu) : \begin{array}{l} \nu \text{ a probability measure on simple} \\ \text{paths in } G \text{ starting in } A \text{ that are} \\ \text{either infinite or finite and end in } B \end{array} \right\}.$$

Obtaining resistance bounds by defining flows using random paths in this manner is referred to as the **method of random paths**. It will be convenient to use the following weakening of the method of random paths. Given the law μ of a random subset W of V, define

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu) = \sum_{v \in V} \mu(v \in W)^2.$$

Lemma 2.4 (Method of random sets)**.** *Let A and B be two finite sets of vertices in an infinite network G, and let μ be a measure on subsets of V such that the subgraph of G induced by V almost surely contains a path starting at A that is either infinite or finite and ends at B. Then*

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B \cup \{\infty\}; G) \leq \sup_{e \in E} c(e)^{-1} \mathcal{E}(\mu). \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Given W, let Γ be a simple path connecting A to B that is contained in W. Then, letting ν be the law of Γ,

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) \leq \sup_e \frac{1}{c(e)} \sum_{e \in E^{\rightarrow}} \nu(e \in \Gamma)^2.$$

Letting Γ' be an independent random path with the same law as Γ, the sum above is exactly the expected number of oriented edges that are used by both Γ and Γ'. Since these paths are simple, they each contain at most one oriented edge emanating from v for each vertex $v \in V$. It follows that the number of oriented edges included in both paths is at most the number of vertices included in both paths. This yields that

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) \leq \sup_{e \in E} \frac{1}{c(e)} \sum_{v \in V} \nu(v \in \Gamma)^2 \leq \sup_{e \in E} \frac{1}{c(e)} \sum_{v \in V} \mu(v \in W)^2 = \mathcal{E}(\mu). \qquad \square$$

2.4 Plane Graphs and their USFs

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $\mathbb{G}$ be the metric space defined as follows. For each edge e of G, choose an orientation of e arbitrarily and let $\{I(e) : e \in E\}$ be a set of disjoint isometric copies of the interval $[0, 1]$. The metric space $\mathbb{G}$ is defined as a quotient of the union $\bigcup_e I(e) \cup V$, where we identify the endpoints of $I(e)$ with the vertices e^- and e^+ respectively, and is equipped with the path metric.

Let S be an orientable surface without boundary, which in this paper will always be a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. A **proper embedding** of a graph G into S is a continuous, injective map $z : \mathbb{G} \to S$ satisfying the following conditions:

(1) (**Every face is a topological disc.**) Every connected component of the complement $S \setminus z(\mathbb{G})$, called a **face** of (G, z), is homeomorphic to the disc. Moreover, for

each connected component U of $S \setminus z(\mathbb{G})$, the set of oriented edges of G that have their left-hand side incident to U forms either a cycle or a bi-infinite path in G.

(2) (z **is locally finite.**) Every compact subset of S intersects at most finitely many edges of $z(\mathbb{G})$. Equivalently, the preimage $z^{-1}(K)$ of every compact set $K \subseteq S$ is compact in $\mathbb{G}$.

A locally finite, connected graph is planar if and only if it admits a proper embedding into some domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. A **plane graph** $G = (G, z)$ is a planar graph G together with a specified embedding $z : \mathbb{G} \to D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. A **plane network** $G = (G, z, c)$ is a planar graph together with a specified embedding and an assignment of positive conductances $c : E \to (0, \infty)$.

Given a pair $G = (G, z)$ of a graph together with a proper embedding z of G into a domain D, the **dual** $G^\dagger$ of G is the graph that has the faces of G as vertices, and has an edge drawn between two faces of G for each edge incident to both of the faces in G. By drawing each vertex of $G^\dagger$ in the interior of the corresponding face of G and each edge of $G^\dagger$ so that it crosses the corresponding edge of G but no others, we obtain an embedding $z^\dagger$ of $G^\dagger$ in D. The edge sets of G and $G^\dagger$ are in natural correspondence, and we write $e^\dagger$ for the edge of $G^\dagger$ corresponding to e. If e is oriented, we let $e^\dagger$ be oriented so that it crosses e from right to left as viewed from the orientation of e. If $G = (G, z, c)$ is a plane network, we assign the conductances $c^\dagger(e^\dagger) = c(e)^{-1}$ to the edges of $G^\dagger$.

2.4.1 USF Duality.

Let G be a plane network with dual $G^\dagger$. For each set $W \subseteq E$, let $W^\dagger := \{e^\dagger : e \notin W\}$. If G is finite and t is a spanning tree of G, then $t^\dagger$ is a spanning tree of $G^\dagger$: the subgraph $t^\dagger$ is connected because t has no cycles, and has no cycles because t is connected. Moreover, the ratio

$$\frac{\prod_{e \in t} c(e)}{\prod_{e^\dagger \in t^\dagger} c^\dagger(e^\dagger)} = \prod_{e \in E} c(e)$$

does not depend on t. It follows that if T is a random spanning tree of G with law UST_G, then $T^\dagger$ is a random spanning tree of $G^\dagger$ with law $\mathsf{UST}_{G^\dagger}$. This duality was extended to infinite proper plane networks by BLPS.

Theorem 2.5 ([9, Theorem 12.2])**.** *Suppose that G is an infinite proper plane network with locally finite dual $G^\dagger$. Then if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a sample of FUSF_G, the subgraph $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ is an essential spanning forest of $G^\dagger$ with law $\mathsf{WUSF}_{G^\dagger}$.*

In Section 5.1 we extend this duality to plane graphs that are not proper by introducing the *transboundary uniform spanning forest*. For an alternative approach to duality in this generalised setting, see [41].

2.5 Circle packing

Besides the background on circle packing given in the introduction, we will also require the following definitions. The **carrier** of a circle packing P, denoted $\mathrm{carr}(P)$, is the union of all the discs of P and of all the faces of $G(P)$, so that the embedding z of $G(P)$ defined by drawing straight lines between the centres of tangent circles is a proper embedding of

$G(P)$ into $\mathrm{carr}(P)$. Similarly, the carrier of a double circle packing $(P, P^\dagger)$ is defined to be the union of all the discs in $P \cup P^\dagger$. Given a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, a circle packing P (or double circle packing $(P, P^\dagger)$) is said to be **in** D if its carrier is D. In particular, a (double) circle packing P is said to be **in the plane** if its carrier is the plane $\mathbb{C}$ and **in the disc** if its carrier is the open unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. Besides their results that we have already mentioned, He and Schramm [25] also proved that every simple triangulation of a countably-connected domain D can be circle packed in a **circle domain**, that is, a domain D' such that every connected component of $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \setminus D'$ is a disc or a point.

Given a double circle packing $(P, P^\dagger)$ of a plane graph G in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we write $\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A)$ for the Euclidean diameter of the set $\{z(v) : v \in A\}$, and write $d_{\mathbb{C}}(A, B)$ for the Euclidean distance between the sets $\{z(v) : v \in A\}$ and $\{z(v) : v \in B\}$. We write $r(v)$ and $r(f)$ for the Euclidean radii of the circles $P(v)$ and $P^\dagger(f)$. If $(P, P^\dagger)$ has carrier $\mathbb{D}$, we write $\sigma(v)$ for $1 - |z(v)|$, which is the distance between $z(v)$ and the boundary of $\mathbb{D}$, and write $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$ for the hyperbolic radius of $P(v)$. (Recall that Euclidean circles in $\mathbb{D}$ are also hyperbolic circles with different centres and radii; see e.g. [3] for further background on hyperbolic geometry.)

We will also require the Ring Lemma of Rodin and Sullivan [49]; see [22] and [1] for quantitative versions. In Section 4.1 we formulate and prove a version of the Ring Lemma for double circle packings, Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 2.6 (The Ring Lemma)**.** *There exists a sequence of positive constants* $\langle k_m : m \geq 3 \rangle$ *such that for every circle packing* P *of every simple triangulation* T*, and every pair of adjacent vertices* u *and* v *of* T*, the ratio of radii* $r(v)/r(u)$ *is at most* $k_{\deg(v)}$*.*

An immediate corollary of the Ring Lemma is that, whenever P is a circle packing in $\mathbb{D}$ of a CP hyperbolic proper plane triangulation T and v is a vertex of T, the hyperbolic radius of P_v is bounded above by a constant $C = C(\deg(v))$.

3 Connectivity of the FUSF

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. In order to apply the theory of circle packing, we first reduce to the case in which G is simple and does not contain a peninsula; this will ensure that the triangulation $T = T(G)$ formed by drawing a star inside each face of G is simple. We will then use the circle packing of T to analyse the WUSF of G.

Let G be a bounded codegree proper plane network with locally finite dual $G^\dagger$. Recall that a **peninsula** of G is a finite connected component of $G \setminus \{v\}$ for some vertex $v \in V$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* G *be a network such that every vertex* v *of* G *is contained in a peninsula of* G*, and let* $\mathfrak{F}$ *be a sample of* WUSF_G*. Then* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is connected and one-ended a.s.*

Proof. Let v_0 be an arbitrary vertex of G, and for each $i \geq 1$ let v_i be a vertex of G such that v_{i-1} is contained in a finite connected component of $G \setminus \{v_i\}$. Let u be another vertex of G and let γ be a path from v_0 to u in G. If u is contained in an infinite connected component of $G \setminus \{v_i\}$, then γ must pass through the vertex v_i. Since γ is finite, we deduce that there exists an integer $I < \infty$ such that u is contained in a finite connected component of $G \setminus \{v_i\}$ for all $i \geq I$. Thus, any infinite simple path from u in G must visit

v_i for all $i \geq I$. We deduce that every essential spanning forest of G is connected and one-ended. □

Thus, to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to consider the case that there is some vertex of G that is not contained in a peninsula. In this case, let G' be the simple plane network formed from G by first splitting every edge e of G into a path of length 2 with both edges given the weight $c(e)$, and then deleting every peninsula of the resulting network. The assumption that G has bounded codegrees and edge resistances bounded above ensures that G' does also (indeed, the maximum codegree of G' is at most twice that of G).

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a plane network and let G' be as above. Then every component of the WUSF of G is one-ended a.s. if and only if every component of the WUSF of G' is one-ended a.s.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a sample of WUSF_G, and let $\mathfrak{F}'$ be the essential spanning forest of G' defined as follows. For each edge $e \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that neither endpoint of e is contained in a peninsula of G, let both of the edges of the path of length two corresponding to e in G' be included in $\mathfrak{F}'$. For each edge $e \notin \mathfrak{F}$ such that neither endpoint of e is contained in a peninsula of G, choose uniformly and independently exactly one of the two edges of the path of length two corresponding to e in G' to be included in $\mathfrak{F}'$. Then every component of $\mathfrak{F}'$ is one-ended if and only if every component of $\mathfrak{F}$ is one-ended, and it is easily verified that $\mathfrak{F}'$ is distributed according to $\mathsf{WUSF}_{G'}$. □

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let G a simple proper plane network with bounded codegrees and bounded edge resistances that does not contain a peninsula. In this section, we will write $\preceq$, $\succeq$ and $\asymp$ for inequalities that hold up to a positive multiplicative constant depending only on $\sup_{f \in F} \deg(f)$ and $\sup_{e \in E} c(e)^{-1}$.

Let T be the triangulation obtained by adding a vertex inside each face of G and drawing an edge between this vertex and each vertex of the face it corresponds to. The assumption that G is simple and does not contain a peninsula ensures that T is a simple triangulation. We identify the vertices of T with $V(G) \cup F(G)$, where $F(G)$ is the set of faces of G. Let $e = (x, y)$ be an edge of G and let $P = \{P(v) : v \in V(G)\} \cup \{P(f) : f \in F(G)\}$ be a circle packing of T in either the plane or the unit disc. (Note that this is not the double circle packing of G, which is less useful for us at this stage since we are not assuming that G has bounded degrees.) By applying a Möbius transformation if necessary, we normalise P by setting the centres $z(x)$ and $z(y)$ to be on the negative and positive real axes respectively, setting the circles $P(x)$ and $P(y)$ to have the origin as their tangency point and, in the parabolic case, fixing the scale by setting $z(y) - z(x) = 1$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a sample of WUSF_G. If T is CP hyperbolic, let V_ε be the set of vertices of G with $|z(v)| \leq 1 - \varepsilon$. Otherwise, T is CP parabolic and we define V_ε to be the set of of vertices of G with $|z(v)| \geq \varepsilon^{-1}$.

Let $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon^e$ be the event that every component of $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$ intersects $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$. On the event $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon^e$, we define η^x to be the rightmost path in $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$ from x to $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$ when looking at x from y, and η^y to be the leftmost path in $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$ from y to $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$ when looking at y from x. The path formed by concatenating the reversal of η^x with e and η^y separates V_ε



FIGURE 4. Illustration of the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case that T is CP hyperbolic. Left: On the event $\mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon$, the paths η^x and η^y split V_ε into two pieces, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. Right: We define a random set containing a path (solid blue) from η^x to $\eta^y \cup \{\infty\}$ in $G \setminus \mathcal{C}$ using a random circle (dashed blue). Here we see two examples, one in which the path ends to η^y, and the other in which the path ends at the boundary (i.e., at infinity).

into two regions, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}$, which are to the left and right of e respectively. We also let $\mathfrak{L}$ and $\mathfrak{R}$ be the corresponding open regions of the ball $B_0(1-\varepsilon)$. Let K be the set of edges that are either included in one of the paths η^x or η^y or in the set $\mathcal{L}$. The condition that η^x and η^y are the rightmost and leftmost paths to $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$ from x and y is equivalent to the condition that K does not contain any open path from x to $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$ other than η^x, and does not contain any open path from y to $V \setminus V_\varepsilon$ other than η^y. It follows that, if we define $K = E$ on the complement of the event $\mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon$, K is a local set for $\mathfrak{F}$[1].

Let $\mathscr{A}^e$ be the event that x and y are in distinct infinite connected components of $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$, so that every component of $\mathfrak{F}$ is one-ended a.s. if and only if $\mathsf{WUSF}_G(e \in \mathfrak{F} \mid \mathscr{A}^e) = 0$ for every edge e of G such that $\mathsf{WUSF}_G(\mathscr{A}^e) > 0$. Let $\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$ denote the event that $\mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon$ occurs and that K does not contain an open path from x to y. Note that $\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_K$ (as defined in Section 2.2.1), and that η^x and η^y are disjoint on the event $\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of closed edges in K and let $\mathcal{O}$ denote the set of open edges in K. By the strong spatial Markov property (Proposition 2.1), conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_K$ and the event $\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$, the law of $\mathfrak{F}$ is equal to the union of $\mathcal{O}$ with a sample of the WUSF of the network $(G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}$ obtained from G by deleting all the revealed closed edges and contracting all the revealed open edges. In particular, by Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula (Theorem 2.3),

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(e \in \mathfrak{F} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_K, \mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon) \leq c(e)\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{W}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\eta^x \leftrightarrow \eta^y;\ G - \mathcal{C}) \tag{3.1}$$

[1]Indeed, K can be explored algorithmically, without querying the status of any edge in $E \setminus K$, by performing a right-directed depth-first search of x's component in $\mathfrak{F}$ and a left-directed depth-first search of y's component in $\mathfrak{F}$, stopping each search when it first leaves V_ε.

Since the edge e was arbitrary and $\mathscr{A}^e = \cap_{\varepsilon>0}\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$, to prove Theorem 1.2 it suffices to prove that there is a deterministic upper bound on the effective resistance appearing in (3.1) that tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

If T is CP hyperbolic, let v^x be the endpoint of the path η^x and let $z_0 = z(v^x)$. Otherwise, T is CP parabolic and we let $z_0 = 0$. We define $V_z(r, r')$ to be the set of vertices v of G such that either the intersection $P_v \cap A_z(r, r')$ is non-empty or the circle P_v is contained in the ball $B_z(r)$ and there is a face f incident to v such that the intersection $P(f) \cap A_z(r, r')$ is non-empty.

Let U be a uniform random variable on the interval $[1, 2]$ and, for each $r > 0$, let μ_r be the law of the random set $W_z(Ur) = V_z(Ur, Ur)$.

Lemma 3.3. *$\mathcal{E}(\mu_r) \preceq 1$ for all $r > 0$.*

Proof. For a vertex v to be included in $W_z(Ur)$, the circle $\{z' \in \mathbb{C} : |z' - z| = Ur\}$ must either intersect the circle $P(v)$ or intersect $P(f)$ for some face f incident to v. Since the union of $P(v)$ and all the $P(f)$ incident to $P(v)$ is contained in the ball of radius $r(v) + 2\max_{f\sim v} r(f)$ about z. Since the codegrees of G are bounded, the Ring Lemma implies that $r(f) \preceq r(v)$ for all incident $v \in V$ and $f \in F$, and so

$$\mu_r(v \in W_z(U)) \le \frac{1}{r}\min\left(2r(v) + 4\max_{f\ni v} r(f),\, r\right) \preceq \frac{1}{r}\min\{r(v), r\}. \tag{3.2}$$

We claim that

$$\sum_{v\in V_z(r,2r)} \min\{r(v),\, r\}^2 \le 16r^2. \tag{3.3}$$

To see this, replace each circle of a vertex in $V_z(r, 2r)$ that has radius larger than r with a circle of radius r that is contained in the original circle and intersects $B_z(2r)$: The circles in this new set still have disjoint interiors, are contained in the ball $B_z(4r)$, and have total area $\pi\sum_{v\in V_z(r,2r)} \min(r(v), r)^2$, yielding (3.3). The claim follows from (3.2) and (3.3) by definition of $\mathcal{E}(\mu_r)$. □

Lemma 3.4 (Existence of uniformly many disjoint annuli)**.** *Suppose that T is CP hyperbolic. The following hold.*

(1) There exists a decreasing sequence $\langle r_n\rangle_{n\ge0}$ with $r_n \in (0, 1/4)$ such that for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| \ge 1 - r_n$, the sets

$$V_z(r_i, 2r_i) \qquad 1 \le i \le n$$

are disjoint.

(2) If G has bounded degrees, then there exists a constant $C = C(\mathbf{M}_G)$ such that we may take $r_n = C^{-n}$ in (1).

Proof. We first prove item (1). We construct the sequence recusively, letting $r_0 = 1/8$. Suppose that $\langle r_i\rangle_{i=0}^n$ satisfying the conclusion of the lemma have already been chosen, and consider the set of vertices

$$K_n = \Big\{v \in V(G) : r(v) \ge \frac{r_n}{4} \text{ or } r(f) \ge \frac{r_n}{4} \text{ for some face } f \text{ incident to } v\Big\}.$$

Since P is a packing of the unit disc, K_n is a finite set. We define r_{n+1} to be

$$r_{n+1} = \max\left\{r \le r_n/4 \,:\, P(v) \subseteq \overline{B_0(1-3r)} \text{ for all } v \in K_n\right\}$$

which is positive since K_n is finite. We claim that $\langle r_i \rangle_{i=0}^{n+1}$ continues to satisfy the conclusion of the lemma. That is, we claim that $V_z(r_{n+1}, 2r_{n+1}) \cap V_z(r_i, 2r_i) = \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| \geq 1 - r_{n+1}$.

Indeed, let z be such that $|z| > 1 - r_{n+1}$ and let $v \in V_z(r_{n+1}, 2r_{n+1})$. By definition of $V_z(r_{n+1}, 2r_{n+1})$, the intersection $P(v) \cap B_z(2r_{n+1})$ is non-empty, and we deduce that $P(v)$ is not contained in the closure of $B_0(1 - 3r_{n+1})$. By definition of r_{n+1}, it follows that $v \notin K_n$ and hence that $r(v) \leq r_n/4$ and $r(f) \leq r_n/4$ for every face f incident to v. Thus, since $r_{n+1} \leq r_n/4$,

$$P(v) \subseteq B_z\left(2r_{n+1} + 2r_n/4\right) \subseteq B_z\left(r_n\right) \text{ and } P(f) \subseteq B_z\left(2r_{n+1} + 4r_n/4\right) \subseteq B_z\left(r_n\right)$$

for every face f incident to v. It follows that $V_z(r_{n+1}, 2r_{n+1}) \cap V_z(r_i, 2r_i) = \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ as claimed.

To prove (2), observe that, by the Ring Lemma (Theorem 2.6), there exists a constant $k = k(\mathbf{M})$ such that for every $C > 1$, every z with $|z| \geq 1 - C^{-m}$, and every $0 \leq n \leq m$, every circle in P that either has centre in $A_z(C^{-n}, 2C^{-n})$ or is tangent to some circle with centre in $A_z(C^{-n}, 2C^{-n})$ has radius at most kC^{-n}. Thus, this set of circles is contained in the ball $B_z((2 + 4k)C^{-n})$. It follows that taking $C = 1/(4 + 8k)$ suffices. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2, hyperbolic case. Suppose that T is CP hyperbolic. Let $\langle r_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ be as in Lemma 3.4 and let $n(\varepsilon)$ be the maximum n such that $\varepsilon < r_n$. On the event $\mathscr{C}_\varepsilon^e$, for each $1 - |z_0| \leq r \leq 1/4$, we claim that the set $W_{z_0}(r)$ contains a path in G from η^x to $\eta^y \cup \{\infty\}$ that is contained in $\mathcal{R} \cup \eta^x \cup \eta^y$, and is therefore a path in $G \setminus \mathcal{C}$.

Indeed, consider the arc $\mathfrak{A}'(r) = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} : |z - z_0| = r\}$, parameterised in the clockwise direction. Let $\mathfrak{A}(r)$ be the subarc of $\mathfrak{A}'(r)$ beginning at the last time that $\mathfrak{A}'(r)$ intersects a circle corresponding to a vertex in the trace of η^x, and ending at the first time after this time that $\mathfrak{A}'(r)$ intersects either $\partial\mathbb{D}$ or a circle corresponding to a vertex in the trace of η^y (see Figure 4). On the event $\mathscr{C}_\varepsilon^e$, the set of vertices of T whose corresponding circles in P are intersected by $\mathfrak{A}(r)$ contains a path from η^x to $\eta^y \cup \{\infty\}$ in T for every $1 - |z_0| \leq r \leq 1/4$. (Indeed, for Lebesgue a.e. $1 - |z_0| \leq r \leq 1/4$, the arc $\mathfrak{A}(r)$ is not tangent to any circle in P, and in this case the set is precisely the trace of a simple path in T.) To obtain a path in G, we divert the path clockwise around each face of G. That is, whenever the path passes from a vertex u of G to a face f of G and then to a vertex v of G, we replace this section of the path with the list of vertices of G incident to f that are between u and v in the counterclockwise order. This construction shows that the subgraph of $G - \mathcal{C}$ induced by the set W_{z_0} contains a path from η^x to $\eta^y \cup \{\infty\}$ as claimed.

Since the measures μ_{r_i} are supported on sets contained in the disjoint sets $V_z(r_i, 2r_i)$, we have that, by Lemma 3.3,

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{W}}(\eta^x \to \eta^y \cup \{\infty\}; G \setminus \mathcal{C}) \preceq \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)} \sum_{i=1}^{n(\varepsilon)} \mu_{r_i}\right) = \frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{E}(\mu_{r_i}) \preceq \frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}$$

and hence, by symmetry,

$$\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{W}}(\eta^y \to \eta^x \cup \{\infty\}; G \setminus \mathcal{C}) \preceq \frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 and Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula, we have

$$\mathsf{WUSF}(e \in \mathfrak{F} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_K,\, \mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon) \preceq \frac{c(e)}{n(\varepsilon)} \tag{3.4}$$

which by Lemma 3.4 converges to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$, completing the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case that T is CP hyperbolic. If G has bounded degrees, then combining (3.4) with Lemma 3.4 implies that there exists a positive constant $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ such that

$$\mathsf{WUSF}(e \in \mathfrak{F} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_K,\, \mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon) \le C\frac{c(e)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} \tag{3.5}$$

for all $\varepsilon \le 1/2$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2, parabolic case. Suppose that T is CP parabolic. Let $r_1 = 1$ and define $\langle r_n \rangle_{n\ge 1}$ recursively by

$$r_n = 1 + \inf\{r \ge r_{n-1} : V_0(r, 2r) \cap V_0(r_{n-1}, 2r_{n-1}) = \emptyset\}.$$

Since $V_0(r_{n-1}, 2r_{n-1})$ is finite, this infimum is finite. By definition, the sets $V_0(r_i, 2r_i)$ are disjoint. A similar analysis to the hyperbolic case shows that, on the event $\mathscr{C}^e_\varepsilon$, for each $r \ge 1$, the set $W_{z_0}(r)$ contains a path in G from η^x to η^y that is contained in $\mathcal{R} \cup \eta^x \cup \eta^y$, and is therefore a path in $G \setminus \mathcal{C}$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $n(\varepsilon)$ be the maximal n such that $r_n \le \varepsilon^{-1}$. Then on the event $\mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon$, by the parallel law,

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\eta^x \leftrightarrow \eta^y;\; G \setminus \mathcal{C}) \preceq \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}\sum_{i=1}^{n(\varepsilon)} \mu_{r_i}\right) \le \frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n(\varepsilon)} \mathcal{E}(\mu_{r_i}) \preceq \frac{1}{n(\varepsilon)}.$$

Thus, by Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula (Theorem 2.3) and the strong spatial Markov property,

$$\mathsf{WUSF}_G(e \in \mathfrak{F} \,|\, \mathcal{F}_K,\, \mathscr{B}^e_\varepsilon) \preceq \frac{c(e)}{n(\varepsilon)}. \tag{3.6}$$

The right hand side converges to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$, completing the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 3.5. Since the random sets used in the CP parabolic case above are always finite, they can also be used to bound free effective resistances. Therefore, by repeating the proof above with the FUSF in place of the WUSF, we deduce that every component of the FUSF of G is one-ended almost surely if T is CP parabolic. Since the FUSF stochastically dominates the WUSF, and an essential spanning forest with one-ended components does not contain any strict subgraphs that are also essential spanning forests, we deduce that if T is CP parabolic, then the FUSF and WUSF of G coincide. In particular, using [9, Theorem 7.3], we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.6. *Let T be a CP parabolic proper plane triangulation. Then T does not admit non-constant harmonic functions of finite Dirichlet energy.*

3.2 The FUSF is connected.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First suppose that $G^\dagger$ is locally finite. Since G has bounded degrees and bounded conductances, $G^\dagger$ has bounded codegrees and bounded resistances. Thus,

Theorem 1.2 implies that every component of the WUSF on $G^\dagger$ is one-ended a.s. and consequently, by duality, that the FUSF on G is connected a.s.

Now suppose that G does not have locally finite dual. In this case, we form a plane network (G', c') from G by adding edges to triangulate the infinite faces of G. We enumerate these additional edges $\langle e_i \rangle_{i \geq 1}$ and define conductances

$$c'(e_i) = 2^{-i-1} \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(e_i^- \leftrightarrow e_i^+; G)^{-1}.$$

Since G' has bounded degrees, bounded conductances and locally finite dual, its FUSF is connected a.s. By Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula (Theorem 2.3), Rayleigh monotonicity and the union bound, the probability that the FUSF of G' contains any of the additional edges e_i is at most

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} c'(e_i) \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(e_i^- \leftrightarrow e_i^+; G') \leq \sum_{i \geq 0} c'(e_i) \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(e_i^- \leftrightarrow e_i^+; G) \leq 1/2.$$

In particular, there is a positive probability that none of the additional edges are contained in the FUSF of G'. The conditional distribution of the FUSF of G' on this event is FUSF_G by the spatial Markov property, and it follows that the FUSF of G is connected a.s. □

4 Critical Exponents

4.1 The Ring Lemma for double circle packings

In this section we extend the Ring Lemma to double circle packings. While unsurprising, we were unable to find such an extension in the literature.

Theorem 4.1 (Ring Lemma)**.** *There exists a family of positive constants $\langle k_{n,m} : n \geq 3, m \geq 3 \rangle$ such that if $(P, P^\dagger)$ is a double circle packing of a simple, 3-connected plane graph G and v is a vertex of G such that $P(v)$ does not contain ∞, then*

$$r(v)/r(f) \leq k_{\deg(v), \max_{g \perp v} \deg(g)}$$

for all $f \in F$ incident to v.

As for triangulations, the Ring Lemma immediately implies that whenenever a simple, 3-connected, CP hyperbolic proper plane network G with bounded degrees and codegrees is circle packed in $\mathbb{D}$, the hyperbolic radii of the discs in $P \cup P^\dagger$ are bounded above by a constant $C = C(\mathbf{M}_G, \mathbf{M}_G^\dagger)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let n be the degree of v and let m be the maximum degree of the faces incident to v in G. We may assume that $r(v) = 1$. Note that for each two distinct discs $P^\dagger(f), P^\dagger(f') \in P^\dagger$ that are not tangent, there is at most one disc $P(u) \in P$ that intersects both $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(f')$, while if $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(f')$ are tangent, there exist exactly two discs in P that intersect both $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(f')$. For each two faces f and f' incident to v, the complement $\partial P(v) \setminus \big(P^\dagger(f_1) \cup P^\dagger(f_2)\big)$ is either a single arc (if $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(f')$ are tangent), or is equal to the union of two arcs (if $P^\dagger(f)$ and $P^\dagger(f')$ are not tangent).

We claim that there exists an function $\psi_m(\cdot, \cdot) : (0, \infty)^2 \to (0, 2\pi]$, increasing in both coordinates, such that if f and f' are two distinct faces of G incident to v, then each of the (one or two) arcs forming the complement $\partial P(v) \setminus (P^\dagger(f_1) \cup P^\dagger(f_2))$ have length at



FIGURE 5. Proof of the Double Ring Lemma. If two dual circles are close but do not touch, there must be many primal circles contained in the crevasse between them. This forces the two dual circles to each have large degree. The right-hand figure is a magnification of the left-hand figure.

least $\psi_m(r(f), r(f'))$. Indeed, let $r(f)$ and $r(f')$ be fixed, and suppose that one of the arcs forming the complement $\partial P(v) \setminus P^\dagger(f) \cup P^\dagger(f')$ is extremely small, with length ε. Let the primal circles incident to f be enumerated $v_1, \ldots, v_{\deg(f)}$, where $v_1 = v$, $P(v_2)$ is the primal circle that is tangent to $P(v)$ and intersects $P^\dagger(f)$ on the same side as the small arc, $P(v_3)$ is the next primal circle that is tangent to $P(v_2)$ and intersects $P^\dagger(f)$, and so on. Since ε is small, $P(v_2)$ must also be very small, as it does not intersect $P^\dagger(f')$. Similarly, if ε is sufficiently small, $P(v_3)$ must also be small, since it also does not intersect $P^\dagger(f')$. See Figure 5. Applying this argument recursively, we see that, if ε is sufficiently small, then the circles $P(v_2), \ldots, P(v_{\deg(f)})$ are collectively too small to contain $\partial P^\dagger(f) \setminus P(v)$ in their union, a contradiction. We write $\psi_m(r(f), r(f'))$ for the minimal ε that is not ruled out as impossible by this argument.

Let the faces incident to the vertex v be indexed in clockwise order $f_1, \ldots, f_n$, where $n = \deg(v)$ and f_1 has maximal radius among the faces incident to v. For each face f incident to v, the arc $\partial P(v) \cap P^\dagger(f)$ has length $2\tan^{-1}(r(f))$. Since $\partial P(v) = \cup_{i=1}^n (\partial P(v) \cap P^\dagger(f_i))$, we deduce that $r(f_1)$ is bounded below by $\tan(\pi/n)$. By definition of ψ_m, we have that $r(f_k)$ satisfies

$$\psi_m\left(\tan(\pi/n), r(f_k)\right) \leq \psi_m\left(r(f_1), r(f_k)\right) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} 2\tan^{-1}\left(r(f_i)\right) \tag{4.1}$$

for all $3 \leq k \leq n$. For each such k, (4.1) yields an implicit upper bound on $r(f_k)$ which converges to zero as $r(f_2)$ converges to zero. This in turn yields a uniform lower bound on $r(f_2)$: if $r(f_2)$ were sufficiently small, the bound (4.1) would imply that $\sum_{k=2}^n 2\tan^{-1}(r(f_k))$ would be less than π, a contradiction (since we have trivially that $2\tan^{-1}(r(f_1)) \leq \pi$). We obtain uniform lower bounds on $r(f_k)$ for each $3 \leq k \leq n$ by repeating the above argument inductively. □

4.2 Good embeddings of planar graphs

If G is a plane graph and $(P, P^\dagger)$ is a double circle packing of G in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, then drawing straight lines between the centres of the circles in P yields a proper embedding

of G in D in which every edge is a straight line. We call such an embedding a **proper embedding of G with straight lines** in D. Following [4], a proper embedding of a graph G with straight lines in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is said to be **η-good** if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) **(No near-flat, flat, or reflexive angles.)** All internal angles of every face in the drawing are at most $\pi - \eta$. In particular, every face is convex.
(2) **(Adjacent edges have comparable lengths.)** For every pair of edges e, e' sharing a common endpoint, the ratio of the lengths of the straight lines corresponding to e and e' in the drawing is at most η^{-1}.

The Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1) has the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *The straight line given by any double circle packing of a plane graph G with bounded degrees and bounded codegrees in a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is η-good for some positive $\eta = \eta(\mathbf{M}_G)$.*

We remark that, in contrast, the embedding of G obtained by circle packing the triangulation $T(G)$ formed by drawing a star inside each face of G (and then erasing these added vertices) does not necessarily yield a good embedding of G.

For the remainder of this section and in Sections 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6, G will be a fixed transient, simple, 3-connected proper plane network with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry, and $(P, P^\dagger)$ will be a double circle packing of G in $\mathbb{D}$. We will write $\preceq$, $\succeq$ and $\asymp$ to denote inequalities or equalities that hold up to positive multiplicative constants depending only upon $\mathbf{M}$. We will also fix an edge $e = (x, y)$ of G and, by applying a Möbius transformation if necessary, normalise $(P, P^\dagger)$ by setting the centres $z(x)$ and $z(y)$ to be on the negative real axis and positive real axis respectively and setting the circles $P(x)$ and $P(y)$ to have the origin as their tangency point.

In [4] and [15], several estimates are established that allow one to compare the random walk on a good embedding of a planar graph with Brownian motion. The following estimate, proven for general good embeddings of proper plane graphs in [5], is of central importance to the proofs of the lower bounds in Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. Recall that $\sigma(v)$ is defined to be $1 - |z(v)|$.

Theorem 4.3 (Diffusive Time Estimate)**.** *There exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(\mathbf{M}) \geq 1$ such that the following holds. For each vertex v of G, let $\langle X_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ be a random walk on G started at v, let $r(v) \leq r \leq C_1^{-1}\sigma(v)$ and let T_r be the first time n that $|z(X_n) - z(v)| \geq r$. Then*

$$\mathbf{E}_v \sum_{n=0}^{T_r} r(X_n)^2 \asymp r^2.$$

It will be shown in a forthcoming paper of Murugan [personal communication] that the constant C_1 above can in fact be taken to be 1.

Theorem 4.4 (Cone Estimate)**.** *Let $\eta = \eta(\mathbf{M}) > 0$ be the constant from Corollary 4.2. There exists a positive constant $q_1 = q_1(\mathbf{M})$ such that the following holds. For each vertex v of G, let $\langle X_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ be a random walk on G started at v, let $0 \leq r \leq \sigma(v)$ and let T_r be the first time n that $|z(X_n) - z(v)| \geq r$. Then for any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ of length at least $\pi - \eta$ we have*

$$\mathbf{P}_v(\arg(z(X_{T_r}) - z(v)) \in I) \geq q_1.$$

We also apply the following result of Benjamini and Schramm [10, Lemma 5.3]; their proof was given for simple triangulations but extends immediately to our setting.

Theorem 4.5 (Convergence Estimate [10])**.** *For every vertex v of G, we have that*

$$\mathbf{P}_v\left(|z(X_n) - z(v)| \geq t\sigma(v) \text{ for some } n \geq 0\right) \preceq \frac{1}{\log t}.$$

We remark that the logarithmic decay in Theorem 4.5 is not sharp. Sharp polynomial estimates of the same quantity have been attained by Chelkak [15, Corollary 7.9].

4.3 Preliminary estimates

For each vertex v of G, let $a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$ denote the hyperbolic area of $P(v)$. Note that, since the hyperbolic radii of the discs in P are bounded from above by the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1),

$$a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \asymp r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)^2 \asymp \sigma(v)^{-2} r(v)^2 \tag{4.2}$$

for every vertex v of G. For the same reason, there exists a constant $s = s(\mathbf{M}) \in (0, 1/2]$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the set

$$\left\{v \in V : z(v) \in A_0(1-\varepsilon, 1-s\varepsilon)\right\}$$

disconnects e from ∞ in G. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$W_\varepsilon := \left\{v \in V : z(v) \in A_0(1-\varepsilon, 1-s^3\varepsilon)\right\}.$$

In the following section, we will wish to estimate sums of the form

$$\sum_{u \in A} a_{\mathbb{H}}(u)\mathbf{P}_u(\tau_B < \infty) \tag{4.3}$$

where A and B are subsets of V. In this section, we prove that, when A is a subset of W_ε for some $\varepsilon > 0$, we can estimate the sum (4.3) in terms of geometric quantities.

Lemma 4.6 (Cone and half-plane estimate)**.** *Let $r \in (0, 1]$, and let $\eta = \eta(\mathbf{M}) > 0$ be the constant from Corollary 4.2. There exist positive constants $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\mathbf{M}, r)$ and $q_2 = q_2(\mathbf{M}, r)$, both increasing in r, such that the following holds. For each vertex v of G and $r \in (0, 1]$ let $\mathfrak{H}_1$ be the cone*

$$\mathfrak{H}_1 = \mathfrak{H}_1(v) = \left\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg z - \arg z(v)| \leq \pi/2 - \eta/4\right\},$$

and let $\mathfrak{H}_2 = \mathfrak{H}_2(v, r)$ be the half-plane containing $z(v)$ whose boundary is the unique straight line with distance $r\sigma(v)$ to $z(v)$ that is orthogonal to the line connecting $z(v)$ to the origin. Then, letting $\tau_{\varepsilon\sigma(v)} = \tau_{W_{\varepsilon\sigma(v)}}$ be the first time the walk visits $W_{\varepsilon\sigma(v)}$, we have that

$$\mathbf{P}_v\left(z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_2 \text{ for all } n \text{ and } z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_1 \text{ for all } n \geq \tau_{\varepsilon\sigma(v)}\right) \geq q_2. \tag{4.4}$$

for all $\varepsilon \leq \delta_1$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{H}_1'$ and $\mathfrak{H}_1''$ be the slightly thinner cones $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z) - \arg(z(v))| \leq \pi/2 - \eta/3\}$ and $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z) - \arg(z(v))| \leq \pi/2 - \eta/2\}$. By Theorem 4.5 there exists some small $\delta' = \delta'(\mathbf{M}) > 0$ such that for each vertex $u \in \mathfrak{H}_1''$ with $\sigma(u) \leq \delta'\sigma(v)$, the random walk started at u has probability at least $1/2$ never to leave $\mathfrak{H}_1'$.

Define numbers $\langle \rho_i \rangle_{i \geq 0}$ and stopping times $\langle T_i \rangle_{i \geq 0}$ by letting $T_0 = 0$ and recursively setting ρ_i to be the distance between $z(X_{T_i})$ and the boundary of $\mathfrak{H}_2 \cap \mathbb{D}$, and T_i to be

$$T_i = \min\left\{n \geq 0 : |z(X_n) - z(X_{T_{i-1}})| \geq \rho_{i-1}\right\}.$$

Let $\mathscr{A}_i$ be the event that $\sigma(X_{T_{i+1}}) \leq \sigma(X_{T_i}) - \rho_i \sin(\eta/2)$, $d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{T_{i+1}}, \partial\mathfrak{H}_2) \geq d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{T_i}, \partial\mathfrak{H}_2) + \rho_i \sin(\eta/2)$ and $z(X_{T_{i+1}}) \in \mathfrak{H}_1''$. Applying Theorem 4.4 yields that

$$\mathbf{P}_v\left(\mathscr{A}_i \mid z(X_{T_i}) \in \mathfrak{H}_1''\right) \geq q_1 \qquad \text{and hence} \qquad \mathbf{P}_v\Big(\bigcap_{i=0}^{n} \mathscr{A}_i\Big) \geq q_1^n \tag{4.5}$$

for every $n \geq 0$. Let $r' = \min\{r, \delta', \sin(\eta/2)\}$ and let $n_0 = \lceil 1/r'^2 \rceil$. If X_{T_i} has distance at least $r'\sigma(v)$ from the boundary of $\mathbb{D} \cap \mathfrak{H}_2$, then $\rho_i \sin(\eta/2) \geq r'^2\sigma(v)$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{P}_v\big(z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_2 \text{ for all } n,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_1'\big) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}_v\Big(\bigcap_{i=0}^{n_0} \mathscr{A}_i\Big) \geq \frac{1}{2} q_1^{n_0}.$$

Next, applying Theorem 4.5, let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\mathbf{M}, r) > 0$ to be sufficiently small that for each vertex u with $z(u) \notin \mathfrak{H}_1$ and $\sigma(u) \leq \delta_1 \sigma(v)$, the random walk started at u has probability at most $q_1^{n_0}/4$ ever to visit $\mathfrak{H}_1'$. We conclude by observing that the probability appearing in (4.4) is at least

$$\mathbf{P}_v\big(z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_2 \text{ for all } n,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_1'\big) - \mathbf{P}_v\big(z(X_{\tau_{W_{\varepsilon\sigma(v)}}}) \notin \mathfrak{H}_1,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} z(X_n) \in \mathfrak{H}_1\big),$$

which is at least $q_1^{n_0}/4$ for all $\varepsilon \leq \delta_1$. We conclude by setting $q_2 = q_1^{n_0}/4$. □

Remark. Although it suffices for our purposes, this argument is rather wasteful. With further effort one can take both q_2 and δ_1 to be polynomials in $1/r$.

Let $p, r \in (0, 1]$. We say that a set $A \subset V$ is (p, r)**-escapable** if for every vertex $v \in A$, the random walk started at v has probability at least p of not returning to A after first leaving the set of vertices whose corresponding discs in P have centres contained in the Euclidean ball of radius $r\sigma(v)$ about $z(v)$. To avoid trivialities, we also declare the empty set to be (p, r)-escapable for all p and r.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $r \in (0, 1]$. There exist positive constants $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\mathbf{M}, r)$ and $p_1 = p_1(\mathbf{M}, r)$, both increasing in r, such that the set*

$$\{v \in V : (1 - \delta_2)\varepsilon \leq \sigma(v) \leq \varepsilon\}$$

is (p_1, r)-escapable for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let $\eta = \eta(\mathbf{M})$ be the constant appearing in Corollary 4.2, and let

$$\delta_2 = \min\left\{\frac{r}{2}\sin\frac{\eta}{2},\ e^{-2C}, 1/4\right\},$$

where $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ is the implicit constant in Theorem 4.5. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, let $v \in \{v \in V : (1 - \delta_2)\varepsilon \leq \sigma(v) \leq \varepsilon\}$, and let T be the stopping time

$$T = \min\left\{n \geq 0 : |z(X_n) - z(v)| \geq r\sigma(v)\right\}.$$

Letting $q_1 = q_1(\mathbf{M})$ be the constant from Theorem 4.4, we have that

$$\mathbf{P}_v\left(\sigma(X_T) \leq \sigma(v) - r\sin(\eta/2)\sigma(v)\right) \geq q_1. \tag{4.6}$$

On the event appearing in the left-hand side of (4.6), the half-plane $\mathfrak{H}_2(X_T, \delta_2)$, defined in Lemma 4.6, is disjoint from the ball $\{z \in C : 1 - |z| \geq (1 - \delta_2)\varepsilon\}$. Thus, the claim follows from (4.6) and Lemma 4.6 by taking $p = q_1(\mathbf{M})q_2(\mathbf{M}, \delta_2)$, where q_2 is as in Lemma 4.6. (Here we are using Lemma 4.6 only to lower bound the probability of the first clause defining the event in the left-hand side of (4.4).) □

Lemma 4.8. *Let A be (p, r)-escapable for some $p \in (0, 1)$ and $r \in (0, C_1^{-1})$, where $C_1 = C_1(\mathbf{M})$ is the constant appearing in Theorem 4.3. Then for every vertex $u \in V$,*

$$\mathbf{E}_u\left[\sum_{n\geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n)\mathbb{1}(X_n \in A)\right] \preceq \frac{r^2}{p(1-r)^2}. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. Define the sequences of stopping times $\langle T_i^- \rangle_{i\geq 0}$ and $\langle T_i^+ \rangle_{i\geq 0}$ by letting $T_0^- = \tau_A$ and recursively letting

$$T_i^+ = \min\left\{n \geq T_i^- : |z(X_n) - z(X_{T_i^-})| \geq r\sigma(X_{T_i^-})\right\}$$

and $T_i^- = \min\{n \geq T_{i-1}^+ : X_n \in A\}$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}_u\left[\sum_{n\geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n)\mathbb{1}(X_n \in A)\right] \leq \sum_{i\geq 0} \mathbf{E}_u\left[\mathbb{1}(T_i^- < \infty)\sum_{n=T_i^-}^{T_i^+-1} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n)\right].$$

Since $\sigma(X_n) \geq (1 - r)\sigma(X_{T_i^-})$ for all $T_i^- \leq n < T_i^+$, the Diffusive Time Estimate (Theorem 4.3), the strong Markov property, and (4.2) imply that

$$\mathbf{E}_u\left[\sum_{n=T_i^-}^{T_i^+-1} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n)\,\middle|\, T_i^- < \infty,\, X_{T_i^-}\right]$$

$$\preceq (1-r)^{-2}\sigma(X_{T_i^-})^{-2}\mathbf{E}_u\left[\sum_{n=T_i^-}^{T_i^+} r(X_n)^2\,\middle|\, T_i^- < \infty,\, X_{T_i^-}\right] \preceq \frac{r^2}{(1-r)^2}.$$

Meanwhile, since A is (p, r)-escapable, we have that $\mathbf{P}_u(T_i^- < \infty) \leq (1 - p)^i$. Combining these estimates yields the desired inequality (4.7). □

We say that a set $A \subset V$ is C-**short-lived** if

$$\mathbf{E}_u\left[\sum_{n\geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n)\mathbb{1}(X_n \in A)\right] \leq C$$

for every $u \in V$. Note that if A is a C-short-lived set of vertices, then every subset of A is also C-short-lived. While Lemma 4.8 states that escapable sets are short-lived, we also have that unions of boundedly many short-lived sets are short-lived with a larger constant. In particular, letting $s = s(\mathbf{M})$ be as above and letting $\delta = \delta_2(\mathbf{M}, C_1^{-1}(\mathbf{M}))$, we have that

$$W_\varepsilon \subseteq \bigcup_{m=0}^{\lceil 3\log_{1-\delta}(s)\rceil} \{v \in V : (1-\delta)^{m+1}\varepsilon \leq \sigma(v) \leq (1-\delta)^m\varepsilon\}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus, combining Corollary 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 immediately yields the following.

Corollary 4.9. *There exist a constant $C_2 = C_2(\mathbf{M}) > 0$ such that the set W_ε is C_2-short-lived for every $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Lemma 4.10. *Let A and B be two sets of vertices in G, and suppose that A is finite and C-short-lived for some $C > 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{v \in A} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_B < \infty) \preceq C \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B).$$

Proof. Let the stopping times τ_i be defined recursively by setting $\tau_0 = \tau_A$ and $\tau_{i+1} = \min\{t > \tau_i : X_t \in A\}$, so that τ_i is the ith time the random walk $\langle X_n \rangle_{n \geq 0}$ visits A. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v \in A} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_B < \infty) &\leq \sum_{v \in A} \sum_{i \geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(B \text{ hit between time } \tau_i \text{ and } \tau_{i+1}) \\ &= \sum_{v \in A} \sum_{u \in A} \sum_{i \geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_i < \infty,\, X_{\tau_i} = u) \mathbf{P}_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+).\end{aligned}$$

Reversing time then yields that

$$\sum_{v \in A} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_B < \infty) \preceq \sum_{v \in A} \sum_{u \in A} \sum_{i \geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_u(\tau_i < \infty,\, X_{\tau_i} = v) \mathbf{P}_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+).$$

By exchanging the order of summation, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v \in A} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_B < \infty) &\preceq \sum_{u \in A} \mathbf{E}_u \left[\sum_{n \geq 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_n) \mathbb{1}(X_n \in A) \right] \mathbf{P}_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+) \\ &\preceq C \sum_{u \in A} c(u) \mathbf{P}_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+).\end{aligned}$$

To conclude, let $\langle V_j \rangle_{j \geq 1}$ be an exhaustion of V and let G_j be the subgraph of G induced by V_j, with conductances inherited from G, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{u \in A} c(u) \mathbf{P}^G_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+) &= \lim_{j \to \infty} \sum_{u \in A} c(u) \mathbf{P}^G_u(\tau_B < \min\{\tau_A^+, \tau_{V \setminus V_j}\}) \\ &\leq \lim_{j \to \infty} \sum_{u \in A} c(u) \mathbf{P}^{G_j}_u(\tau_B < \tau_A^+) = \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B). \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A)$ and $d_{\mathbb{C}}(A, B)$ denote the Euclidean diameter of $\{z(v) : v \in A\}$ and the Euclidean distance between $\{z(v) : v \in A\}$ and $\{z(v) : v \in B\}$ respectively.

Lemma 4.11. *Let A and B be disjoint sets of vertices in G. Then*

$$\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B) \preceq \frac{\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A)^2}{\min\left\{\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A),\, d_{\mathbb{C}}(A, B)\right\}^2},$$

with the convention that the right-hand side is 1 if $\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A) = 0$.

Proof. Let $D = \mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A)$. If $D = 0$ then A is a single vertex v and $\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B) \leq c(v) \preceq 1$, so assume not. Recall the **extremal length** characterisation of the free effective conductance [40, Exercise 9.42]: For each function $\ell : E \to [0,\infty)$ assigning a non-negative length to every edge e of G, let d_ℓ be the shortest path pseudometric on G induced by ℓ. Then

$$\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B) = \inf\left\{ \frac{\sum_{e\in E} c(e)\ell(e)^2}{d_\ell(A,B)^2} : \ell : E \to [0,\infty),\, d_l(A,B) > 0 \right\}.$$

Let W be the set of vertices v of G whose corresponding circles intersect the D-neighbourhood of $z(A)$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Define lengths by setting $\ell(e)$ to be

$$\ell(e) = \begin{cases} \min\left\{|z(e^-) - z(e^+)|,\, D\right\} & \text{if } e \text{ has an endpoint in } W \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$d_\ell(A,B) \geq \min\left\{D,\, d_{\mathbb{C}}(A,B))\right\} > 0 \tag{4.8}$$

while, since $|z(e^-) - z(e^+)| = r(e^-) + r(e^+)$,

$$\sum_e c(e)\ell(e)^2 \preceq \sum_{v\in W}\sum_{v'\sim v} \min\left\{r(v) + r(v'),\, D\right\}^2 \preceq \sum_{v\in W} \min\left\{r(v),\, D\right\}^2, \tag{4.9}$$

where the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1) is used in the second inequality. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, consider replacing each circle corresponding to a vertex in W that has radius larger than D with a circle of radius D that is contained in the original circle and intersects the D-neighbourhood of $z(A)$. This yields a set of circles contained in the $3D$-neighbourhood of $z(A)$. Comparing the total area of this set of circles with that of the $3D$-neighbourhood of $z(A)$ yields that

$$\sum_{v\in W} \min\left\{r(v),\, D\right\}^2 \preceq D^2. \tag{4.10}$$

We conclude by combining (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10). □

For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, we define

$$U^m_\varepsilon(0) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{D} : 1 - \varepsilon \leq |z| \leq 1 - s^3\varepsilon \text{ and } \mathrm{sgn}(m)\frac{4^{|m|}}{5^{|m|}}\pi \leq \arg z \leq \mathrm{sgn}(m)\frac{4^{|m|-1}}{5^{|m|-1}}\pi \right\}$$

and define $U^m_\varepsilon(\theta)$ to be the rotated set $e^{i\theta}U^m_\varepsilon$.

Lemma 4.12. *There exist universal constants $\delta_3, \delta_4 > 0$ and $k < \infty$ such that*

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U^m_\varepsilon(\theta), \{re^{i\theta} : r \geq 0\}\right) \geq (2 + \delta_3)\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U^m_\varepsilon(\theta)\right)$$

for all $\theta \in [-\pi,\pi]$, $\varepsilon \leq \delta_4$ and $|m| \leq \log_{5/4}(1/\varepsilon) - k$.

The constants here are more important than usual since we will later need to estimate the difference $\frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U^m_\varepsilon(\theta), \{re^{i\theta} : r \geq 0\}\right) - \mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U^m_\varepsilon(\theta)\right)$.

Proof. We begin by calculating, using elementary trigonometry, that

$$\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(U^m_\varepsilon(\theta)) \leq \frac{4^{|m|-1}}{5^{|m|}}\pi + \varepsilon$$

and

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(U_\varepsilon^m(\theta), \{re^{i\theta} : r \geq 0\}) = \begin{cases} 1-\varepsilon & |m| \leq 3 \\ (1-\varepsilon)\sin\left(\frac{4^{|m|}}{5^{|m|}}\pi\right) & |m| \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

By concavity of the function $\sin(t)$ on $[0,\pi]$, we have that $\sin(t) \geq 2t/\pi$ for all $t \in [0,\pi/2]$, and in particular

$$\frac{\operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(U_\varepsilon^m(\theta))}{d_{\mathbb{C}}(U_\varepsilon^m(\theta), \{re^{i\theta} : r \geq 0\})} \leq \frac{1}{8(1-\varepsilon)}\pi + \frac{5^{|m|}\varepsilon}{2\cdot 4^{|m|}(1-\varepsilon)} \leq \frac{1}{8(1-\delta_2)}\pi + \frac{4^k\delta_4}{2\cdot 5^k(1-\delta_4)}$$

for all $\varepsilon \leq \delta_4$ and $|m| \leq \log_{5/4}(1/\varepsilon) - k$. This upper bound is less than $\pi/7 < 1/2$ when δ_4 is sufficiently small and k is sufficiently large. □

4.4 Wilson's Algorithm

Wilson's algorithm rooted at infinity [9, 59] is a powerful method of sampling the WUSF of an infinite, transient graph by joining together loop-erased random walks. We now give a very brief description of the algorithm (see [40] for a detailed exposition). Let G be a transient network. Let γ be a path in G that visits each vertex of G at most finitely many times. The **loop-erasure** is formed by erasing cycles from γ chronologically as they are created. (The loop-erasure of a random walk path is referred to as **loop-erased random walk** and was first studied by Lawler [37].) Let $\{v_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an enumeration of the vertices of G. Let $\mathfrak{F}_0 = \emptyset$ and define a sequence of forests in G as follows:

(1) Given $\mathfrak{F}_i$, start an independent random walk from v_{i+1}. Stop this random walk if it hits the set of vertices already included in $\mathfrak{F}_i$, running it forever otherwise.
(2) Form the loop-erasure of this random walk path and let $\mathfrak{F}_{i+1}$ be the union of $\mathfrak{F}_i$ with this loop-erased path.

Then the forest $\mathfrak{F} = \bigcup_{i\geq 0}\mathfrak{F}_i$ is a sample of the WUSF of G [9, Theorem 5.1].

4.5 Proof of Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5

Recall that $e = (x, y)$ is a fixed edge. We write $\succeq_e$ to denote a lower bound that holds up to a positive multiplicative constant that depends only on $\mathbf{M}$ and $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, and that is increasing in $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the WUSF of G. Let $\mathscr{R}_\varepsilon^e$ be the event that $\operatorname{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)$ contains a vertex whose center is within Euclidean distance ε of the unit circle, and let $\mathscr{D}_R^e$ be the event that $\operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\operatorname{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R$. Then, letting $\varepsilon(R) = 1 - \tanh(R/2)$, we have that $\mathscr{R}^e_{\varepsilon(R)/2} \subseteq \mathscr{D}_R^e \subseteq \mathscr{R}^e_{\varepsilon(R)}$. Thus, to prove Theorem 1.4, it suffices to prove that

$$\log(1/\varepsilon)^{-1} \preceq_e \mathbb{P}(\mathscr{R}_\varepsilon^e) \preceq \log(1/\varepsilon)^{-1}$$

for all $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$. The proof of Theorem 1.2, and in particular of the estimate (3.5), adapts immediately to yield the desired upper bound (i.e., if the analysis there is carried out using the double circle packing of G rather than the circle packing of T); the remainder of this proof is devoted to proving the lower bound. This will be done by applying a second

moment argument to the random variable

$$Z_\varepsilon = \sum_{v \in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbb{1}(v \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)),$$

which, by definition of W_ε, is positive if and only if $\mathscr{R}^e_\varepsilon$ occurs.

Lemma 4.13. *There exists a positive constant $\delta_5 = \delta_5(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$, increasing in $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, such that $\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] \succeq_e 1$ for all $\varepsilon \le \delta_5$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.13. If we generate $\mathfrak{F}$ using Wilson's algorithm, starting with the vertex v, then v is in $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)$ if and only if the loop-erased random walk from v passes through $e = (x, y)$. In particular, we obtain the lower bound

$$\mathbb{P}(v \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \ge \mathbf{P}_v \left(\tau_x < \infty,\, X_{\tau_x+1} = y,\, \langle X_n \rangle_{n \ge \tau_x + 1} \text{ disjoint from } \langle X_n \rangle_{n=0}^{\tau_x}\right)$$

and hence, decomposing according to the value of τ_x,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] \ge \sum_{v \in W_\varepsilon} \sum_{m \ge 1} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_v \left(\tau_x = m,\, X_{m+1} = y,\, \langle X_n \rangle_{n \ge m} \text{ disjoint from } \langle X_n \rangle_{n=0}^{m-1}\right).$$

Letting $\langle Y_n \rangle_{n \ge 0}$ be a random walk started at x independent of $\langle X_n \rangle_{n \ge 0}$ and reversing time yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] \succeq \sum_{v \in W_\varepsilon} \sum_{m \ge 1} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \mathbf{P}_x \left(X_m = v,\, \mathscr{C}_m\right) = \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{m \ge 0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m) \mathbb{1}\left(X_m \in W_\varepsilon,\, \mathscr{C}_m\right) \right],$$

where $\mathscr{C}_m$ is the event

$$\mathscr{C}_m = \left\{ Y_1 = y, \text{ and } \langle X_n \rangle_{n=1}^m \text{ disjoint from } \langle Y_n \rangle_{n \ge 0} \right\}.$$

(Note that $\langle X_n \rangle_{n=0}^m$ does not return to x after time 0 on the event $\mathscr{C}_m$.) Let τ_1 be the first time that the random walk $\langle X_m \rangle_{m \ge 0}$ visits $\{v \in V : s^2 \varepsilon \le \sigma(v) \le s\varepsilon\}$, which is finite a.s. by definition of s, and let τ_2 be the first time m after τ_1 that $|z(X_m) - z(X_{\tau_1})| \ge C_1^{-1} s^2 \varepsilon$, where $C_1 = C_1(\mathbf{M}) \ge 1$ is the constant from Theorem 4.3. Then $X_m \in W_\varepsilon$ for all $\tau_1 \le m \le \tau_2$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] &\succeq \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m) \mathbb{1}\left(\mathscr{C}_m\right) \right] \\
&\ge \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m) \mathbb{1}\left(d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \ge 0\}) > \varepsilon/s,\, \mathscr{C}_{\tau_2}\right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The events $\mathscr{C}_{\tau_1} \cap \{d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \ge 0\}) > \varepsilon/s\}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{\tau_2} \cap \{d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \ge 0\}) > \varepsilon/s\}$ are equal, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] &\succeq \mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m) \mathbb{1}\left(d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \ge 0\}) > \varepsilon/s, \mathscr{C}_{\tau_1}\right) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_x \left[\mathbf{E}_x \left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m) \,\middle|\, X_{\tau_1} \right] \mathbb{1}\left(d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \ge 0\}) > \varepsilon/s, \mathscr{C}_{\tau_1}\right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.2) and the Diffusive Time Estimate (Theorem 4.3), we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} a_{\mathbb{H}}(X_m)\,\middle|\, X_{\tau_1}\right] \asymp \varepsilon^{-2}\mathbf{E}_x\left[\sum_{m=\tau_1}^{\tau_2} r(X_m)^2\,\middle|\, X_{\tau_1}\right] \asymp 1,$$

and hence that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] \succeq \mathbf{P}_x(d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \geq 0\}) > \varepsilon/s, \mathscr{C}_{\tau_1}). \tag{4.11}$$

By the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1), there exists a positive constant $k = k(\mathbf{M})$ such that $\min\{r(x), r(y)\} \geq r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)/k$. Let $\delta_1(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)/k)$ be the constant appearing in Lemma 4.6, and let $\delta_5 = \delta_5(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)) \leq \delta_1(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)/k)$ be sufficiently small that every vertex u that has $\sigma(u) \leq \delta_5$ and is contained in the cone $\mathfrak{H}_1(x)$ has distance at least δ_5/s from the half-plane $\mathfrak{H}_2(y, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)/k)$ (as defined in Lemma 4.6). Applying Lemma 4.6 to both random walks X and Y conditioned on $Y_1 = y$ yields that

$$\mathbf{P}_x(d_{\mathbb{C}}(X_{\tau_1}, \{Y_n : n \geq 0\}) > \varepsilon/s, \mathscr{C}_{\tau_1}) \succeq q_2(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)/k)^2 \succeq_e 1$$

for all $\varepsilon \leq \delta_5$, concluding the proof. □

Lemma 4.14. $\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2] \preceq \mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon]\log(1/\varepsilon)$ *for all* $0 < \varepsilon \leq \delta_4$, *where* δ_4 *is the constant from Lemma 4.12.*

Proof. For each two vertices u and v in G, let

$$H(u,v) := \big\{w \in V : |z(w) - z(u)| \leq |z(w) - z(v)|\big\}$$

be the set of vertices closer to u than to v with respect to the Euclidean metric on the circle packing. More generally, for a vertex u and a set $A \subset V$, let

$$H(u,A) := \big\{w \in V : |z(w) - z(u)| \leq |z(w) - z(v)| \text{ for some } u \in A\big\} = \bigcup_{v \in A} H(u,v).$$

Note that for every vertex u and set A,

$$d_{\mathbb{C}}(A, H(u,A)) \geq \inf_{v_1,v_2 \in A} d_{\mathbb{C}}(v_2, H(u,v_2)) - d_{\mathbb{C}}(v_1,v_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{C}}(u,A) - \mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(A). \tag{4.12}$$

Expand $\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2]$ as the sum

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2] = \sum_{u,v \in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(u)a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbb{P}\left(u, v \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)\right).$$

If u and v are both in the past of e in $\mathfrak{F}$, let $w(u,v)$ be the first vertex at which the unique simple paths in $\mathfrak{F}$ from u to e and from v to e meet. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2] \leq 2\sum_{u,v \in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(u)a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbb{P}\left(u, v \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e) \text{ and } w(u,v) \in H(u,v)\right).$$

Consider generating $\mathfrak{F}$ using Wilson's algorithm rooted at infinity, starting first with u and then v. In order for u and v both to be in the past of e and for $w(u,v)$ to be in $H(u,v)$, we must have that the simple random walk from v hits $H(u,v)$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2] \leq 2\sum_{u \in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(u)\mathbb{P}(u \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \sum_{v \in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)} < \infty). \tag{4.13}$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{v\in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)}<\infty) \preceq \log(1/\varepsilon) \tag{4.14}$$

for all $\varepsilon \le \delta_4$ and $u \in W_\varepsilon$.

Recall the definition of U_ε^m from Lemma 4.12. Let k be the universal constant from Lemma 4.12, let $\ell(\varepsilon) = \lceil \log_{5/4}(\varepsilon) - k \rceil$, and let $\theta = \arg(u)$. For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 \le |m| \le \ell(\varepsilon)$, let $S_\varepsilon^m(\theta)$ be the set of vertices whose centres are contained in $U_\varepsilon^m(\theta)$, and let

$$S_\varepsilon^0 = S_\varepsilon^0(u) := \left\{ v \in W_\varepsilon : \left| \arg \frac{z(v)}{z(u)} \right| \le \frac{5^k \pi \varepsilon}{4^k} \right\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\in W_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)}<\infty) &= \sum_{m=-\ell(\varepsilon)}^{\ell(\varepsilon)} \sum_{v\in S_\varepsilon^m} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)}<\infty) \\ &\le \sum_{m=-\ell(\varepsilon)}^{\ell(\varepsilon)} \sum_{v\in S_\varepsilon^m} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,S_\varepsilon^m)}<\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Since S_ε^m is contained in W_ε, it is C-short-lived for some $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ by Corollary 4.9. Thus, applying Lemmas 4.10–4.12 together with (4.13) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\in S_\varepsilon^m} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,S_\varepsilon^m)}<\infty) &\preceq \frac{\operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(S_\varepsilon^m)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{C}}\left(S_\varepsilon^m, u\right) - \operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(S_\varepsilon^m\right)\right)^2} \\ &\preceq \frac{\operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(U_\varepsilon^m)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U_\varepsilon^m(\theta), \{re^{i\theta} : r \ge 0\}\right) - \operatorname{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(U_\varepsilon^m(\theta)\right)\right)^2} \preceq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

for $\varepsilon \le \delta_4$ and $1 \le |m| \le \ell(\varepsilon)$. This in turn yields (4.14) when combined with (4.15) and the fact that $\sum_{v\in S_\varepsilon^0} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \preceq 1$. □

Let δ_4 be the constant from Lemma 4.12 and let $\delta_5 = \delta_5(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$ be the constant from Lemma 4.13. The lower bound of Theorem 1.4 now follows from Lemmas 4.13 and 4.14 together with the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, which imply that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_\varepsilon > 0) \ge \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon]^2}{\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon^2]} \succeq_e \frac{1}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$$

for all $\varepsilon \le \min\{\delta_4, \delta_5\}$. Since $\mathbb{P}(Z_\varepsilon > 0)$ is an increasing function of ε and $\min\{\delta_4, \delta_5\}$ is an increasing function of $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_\varepsilon > 0) \ge \mathbb{P}(Z_{\min\{\delta_4,\delta_5\}\varepsilon} > 0) \succeq_e \frac{1}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$$

for all $\varepsilon \le 1/2$. □

Lemma 4.15. $\mathbb{E}[Z_\varepsilon] \preceq 1$ *for all* $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. By Wilson's algorithm, $\mathbb{P}(v \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \leq \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_x < \infty)$. Thus, the claim follows immediately from Corollary 4.9 and Lemma 4.10, taking $A = W_\varepsilon \setminus \{x\}$ and $B = \{x\}$, since $\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(x \leftrightarrow V \setminus \{x\}) \leq c(x) \preceq 1$. The claim can also be proven more directly by a time reversal argument similar to that carried out in the proof of Lemma 4.13. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We continue to use the notation from the proof of Theorem 1.4. We first prove the upper bound. Let $R \geq 1$. Applying Markov's inequality and Lemma 4.15 we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{R^{1/2}} Z_{s^{-3k}} \geq R\Bigg) \leq \frac{1}{R}\mathbb{E}\Bigg[\sum_{k=0}^{R^{1/2}} Z_{s^{-3k}}\Bigg] \preceq R^{-1/2}, \tag{4.17}$$

and hence that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R\Big) \leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{R^{1/2}} Z_{s^{-3k}} \geq R\Bigg) + \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\sum_{k=R^{1/2}}^{\infty} Z_{s^{-3k}} > 0\Bigg) \preceq R^{-1/2}, \tag{4.18}$$

where the second inequality follows from Theorem 1.4 and (4.17).

We now obtain a matching lower bound. Let δ_4 be the constant from Lemma 4.12 and let $\delta_5 = \delta_5(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$ be the constant from Lemma 4.13, and let $R_0 = R_0(\mathbf{M}, r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)) = (4/9)\log^2_{1/s}(1/\min\{\delta_4, \delta_5\})$, so that that $s^{-3R^{1/2}/2}$ is less than both δ_4 and δ_5 for all $R \geq R_0$. Let $R \geq R_0$ and let

$$W = \bigcup_{k=\frac{1}{2}R^{1/2}}^{R^{1/2}} W_{s^{-3k}} \qquad \text{and let} \qquad Z = \sum_{k=\frac{1}{2}R^{1/2}}^{R^{1/2}} Z_{s^{-3k}}.$$

The argument used to derive (4.13) in the proof of Lemma 4.14 also yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] \leq 2\sum_{u\in W} a_{\mathbb{H}}(u)\mathbb{P}(u \in \mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \sum_{v\in W} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)} < \infty). \tag{4.19}$$

Let $u \in W$ and let $\theta = \arg(z(u))$. Let $\ell(s^{-3k})$ and the sets $S^m_{s^{-3k}}(\theta)$ be defined as in the proof of Lemma 4.14. Then,

$$\sum_{v\in W} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)} < \infty) \leq \sum_{k=\frac{1}{2}R^{1/2}}^{R^{1/2}} \sum_{m=-\ell(s^{-3k})}^{\ell(s^{-3k})} \Bigg[\sum_{v\in S^m_\varepsilon} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}(\tau_{H(u,S^m_\varepsilon)} < \infty)\Bigg]. \tag{4.20}$$

The arguments yielding the estimate (4.16) in the proof of Lemma 4.14 also yield that the sums appearing in the square brackets on the right-hand side of (4.20) are bounded above by a constant depending only on $\mathbf{M}$. It follows that

$$\sum_{v\in W} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v)\mathbf{P}_v(\tau_{H(u,v)} < \infty) \preceq R$$

for all $u \in W$, and hence that $\mathbb{E}[Z^2] \preceq R\mathbb{E}[Z]$.

Next, Lemma 4.15 implies that $\mathbb{E}[Z] \succeq_e R^{1/2}$, while Theorem 1.4 implies that $\mathbb{P}(Z > 0) \preceq R^{-1/2}$. Thus, there exists a positive constant $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ such that $\mathbb{E}[Z \mid Z >$

$0] \geq CR$ for all sufficiently large R. Applying the second moment estimate above, the Paley-Zigmund Inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z \geq \frac{C}{2}R \,\middle|\, Z > 0\right) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z \mid Z > 0]^2}{4\mathbb{E}[Z^2 \mid Z > 0]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z]^2}{4\mathbb{E}[Z^2]\mathbb{P}(Z > 0)} \succeq_e 1. \tag{4.21}$$

Combining (4.21) with the lower bound of Theorem 1.4 yields that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq \frac{C}{2}R\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(Z \geq \frac{C}{2}R\right) \succeq_e R^{-1/2}$$

for all $R \geq R_0$. Since the probability on the left hand side is decreasing in R, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R) \succeq_e R^{-1/2}$$

as claimed. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a spanning forest of G and let $e^\dagger$ be the edge of $G^\dagger$ dual to $e = (x, y)$. The past of $e^\dagger$ in the dual forest $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ is contained in the region of the plane bounded by e and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)$, so that

$$\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)) \geq \mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)).$$

Meanwhile, if $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)$ is non-empty, then every edge in the path $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)$ is incident to a face of G that is in $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)$. By the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1), the hyperbolic radii of circles in $P \cup P^\dagger$ are bounded above. We deduce that there exists a constant $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ such that

$$\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)) \leq \mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)) + C.$$

We deduce Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 1.4 by applying these estimates when $\mathfrak{F}$ is the FUSF of G and $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ is the WUSF of $G^\dagger$. □

4.6 The uniformly transient case

Recall that a graph is said to be **uniformly transient** if $\mathbf{p} = \inf_{v \in V} \mathbf{P}_v(\tau_v^+ = \infty)$ is positive. If the graph has bounded degrees, this is equivalent to the property that $\mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{eff}}(v \to \infty)$ is bounded away from zero uniformly in v.

Proposition 4.16. *Then there exists a constant $C = C(\mathbf{M})$ such that*

$$r_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \geq \frac{1}{C} \exp\left(-C\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(v \to \infty)\right).$$

Proof. By applying a Möbius transformation if necessary, we may assume that the circle $P(v)$ is centered at the origin. By the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1), $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$ is bounded above by a constant depending only on the maximum degree and codegree of G. Applying [19, Corollary 3.3] together with Theorem 4.1 yields that $\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(v \to \infty) \geq c \log(1/r(v))$ for some constant $c = c(\mathbf{M})$. Since the hyperbolic radii are bounded, the Euclidean radius $r(v)$ is comparable to $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$. □

We are now ready to prove Corollary 1.6. In the rest of this subsection, we will use $\preceq, \succeq$ and $\asymp$ to denote inequalities or equalities that hold up to positive multiplicative constants depending only on $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{p}$.

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a spanning forest of G and let $e^\dagger$ be the edge of $G^\dagger$ dual to $e = (x, y)$. The past of $e^\dagger$ in the dual forest $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ is contained in the region of the plane bounded by e and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)$. The non-amenability of the hyperbolic plane implies that the perimeter of any set is at least a constant multiple of its area, and so

$$\sum_{v \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)} r_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \succeq \mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger) \right). \tag{4.22}$$

On the other hand, if $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)$ is non-empty, then every edge in the path $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)$ is incident to a face of G that is in $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)$. We deduce that if $\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger)$ is non-empty then

$$\mathrm{area}_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}^\dagger}(e^\dagger) \right) \succeq \sum_{v \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v). \tag{4.23}$$

Note that neither estimate (4.22) or (4.23) required uniform transience. Proposition 4.16 and the Ring Lemma (Theorem 4.1) imply that

$$|\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x, y)| \asymp \sum_{v \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)} r_{\mathbb{H}}(v) \asymp \sum_{v \in \Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)} a_{\mathbb{H}}(v).$$

Combining the above estimates in the case that $\mathfrak{F}$ is the FUSF of G and $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ is the WUSF of $G^\dagger$ allows us to deduce Corollary 1.6 from Theorem 1.5. □

Let (X_1, d_1) and (X_2, d_2) be metric spaces and let α, β be positive. A (not necessarily continuous) function $\phi : X_1 \to X_2$ is said to be an (α, β)**-rough isometry** if the following hold.

(1) (ϕ **roughly preserves distances.**) $\alpha^{-1} d_1(x, y) - \beta \leq d_2(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \leq \alpha d_1(x, y) + \beta$ for all $x, y \in X_1$.
(2) (ϕ **is almost surjective.**) For every $x_2 \in X_2$, there exists $x_1 \in X_1$ such that $d_2(\phi(x_1), x_2) \leq \beta$.

See [40, §2.6] for further background on rough isometries. We write d_G for the graph distance on V.

Corollary 4.17. *Let G be a uniformly transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry. Let d_G denote the graph distance on V, let $(P, P^\dagger)$ be a double circle packing of G in $\mathbb{D}$, and let $z(v)$ be the centre of the disc in P corresponding to the vertex v. Then there exist positive constants $\alpha = \alpha(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ and $\beta = \beta(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ such that z is an (α, β)-rough isometry from (V, d_G) to $(\mathbb{D}, d_{\mathbb{H}})$.*

Proof. Proposition 4.16 implies that for every vertex v of G, $r_{\mathbb{H}}(v)$ is bounded both above and away from zero by positive constants. Almost surjectivity is immediate. For each two vertices u and v in G, the shortest graph distance path between them induces a curve in $\mathbb{D}$ (by going along the hyperbolic geodesics between the centres of the circles in the path) whose hyperbolic length is $\succeq d_G(u, v)$.

Conversely, let γ be the hyperbolic geodesic between $z(u)$ and $z(v)$, and consider the set W of vertices w of G such that either $P(w)$ intersects γ or $P^\dagger(f)$ intersects γ for some face f incident to w. Let d be the length of γ. Since all circles in $(P, P^\dagger)$ have a uniform upper bound on their hyperbolic radii, we deduce that all circles in W are contained in a hyperbolic neighbourhood of constant thickness about γ, and hence the total area of these circles is $\preceq d$. Since the radii of the circles are also bounded away from zero, we deduce

that the cardinaility of W is also $\preceq d$. Since W contains a path in G from u to v, we deduce that $d_G(u,v)$ is $\preceq d$ as required. □

We summarise the situation for uniformly transient graphs in the following corollary, which follows immediately by combining Corollary 4.17 with Theorems 1.3–1.5 and Corollary 1.6. We write diam_G for the graph distance diameter of a set of vertices in G.

Corollary 4.18 (Graph distance exponents)**.** *Let G be a uniformly transient, simple, 3-connected, proper plane network with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry, and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the free uniform spanning forest of G. Let $\mathbf{p} > 0$ be a uniform lower bound on the escape probabilities of G. Then there exist positive constants $k_1 = k_1(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ and $k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{p})$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
k_1 R^{-1} &\leq \mathsf{FUSF}_G(\mathrm{diam}_G(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)) \geq R) &&\leq k_2 R^{-1},\\
k_1 R^{-1} &\leq \mathsf{WUSF}_G(\mathrm{diam}_G(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R) &&\leq k_2 R^{-1},\\
k_1 R^{-1/2} &\leq \mathsf{WUSF}_G(|\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)| \geq R) &&\leq k_2 R^{-1/2}, \text{ and}\\
k_1 R^{-1/2} &\leq \mathsf{FUSF}_G(|\Gamma_{\mathfrak{F}}(x,y)| \geq R) &&\leq k_2 R^{-1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

for every edge $e = (x,y)$ of G and every $R \geq 1$.

5 Multiply-connected plane graphs and the transboundary uniform spanning forest

5.1 The Transboundary Uniform Spanning Forest

Let G be an infinite network and let $\langle V_n \rangle_{n \geq 1}$ be an exhaustion of G. For each n, we define the network $G_n^\#$ by contracting each connected component of $V \setminus V_n$ and deleting all the self-loops that are created. We identify the edges of $G_n^\#$ with the set of edges of G with at least one endpoint in V_n. Let A and B be finite sets of vertices of G. Then for all n such that $A \cup B \subseteq V_n$, Rayleigh monotonicity implies that

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_{n+1}^\#) \leq \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_n^\#). \tag{5.1}$$

We define the **transboundary effective resistance** between A and B to be the limit

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_n^\#) \tag{5.2}$$

which exists by the above monotonicity. Our terminology is chosen due to the close analogy between the transboundary effective resistance and Schramm's transboundary extremal length [51].

As in the proof of the existence of the limit defining WUSF_G, it can be deduced from Kirchoff's Effective Resistance Formula, Rayleigh monotonicty, and the spatial Markov property that

$$\mathsf{UST}_{G_{n+1}^\#}(S \subseteq T) \geq \mathsf{UST}_{G_n^\#}(S \subseteq T)$$

for every finite set $S \subset E$. We define the **transboundary uniform spanning forest (TUSF)** to be the weak limit of the uniform spanning tree measures on $G_n^\#$: For each finite set $S \subset E$,

$$\mathsf{TUSF}_G(S \subset \mathfrak{F}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{UST}_{G_n^\#}(S \subset T); \tag{5.3}$$

The existence of this weak limit follows from the monotonicity above (the convergence of the probabilities of all other cylinder events follows by inclusion-exclusion). What we are calling the TUSF was previously studied (but not named) by R. Solomyak [55], primarily in the context of Cayley graphs. Our interest in the TUSF stems from the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let G be a plane network with locally finite dual $G^\dagger$ and let $\mathfrak{F}$ have law FUSF_G. Then $\mathfrak{F}^\dagger$ has law $\mathsf{TUSF}_{G^\dagger}$.*

Proof. Let $\langle V_n \rangle_{n\geq 0}$ be an exhaustion of G, and let G_n be the subgraph of G induced by V_n, which is drawn in the plane by restricting the drawing of G in the plane to G_n. Let $\langle F_n \rangle_{n\geq 0}$ be the exhaustion of $G^\dagger$ defined by letting $f \in F_n$ if and only if every vertex of G incident to f is contained in V_n. Then the dual of G_n may be obtained from $G^\dagger$ by contracting each connected component of $F \setminus F_n$ into a point and deleting all of the self-loops that are created. Thus, the claim follows from duality for the USTs of finite plane graphs by taking the limit as $n \to \infty$. □

We also note that the TUSF obeys the natural variants of Kirchhoff's Effective Resistance Formula and the Strong Spatial Markov Property.

5.2 Transboundary paths and cycles

In order to formulate the dual statement to Theorem 1.8, we must first introduce some topology. Let G be an infinite network. Recall that an **end** ξ of G is a function assigning a connected component ξ_K of $G \setminus K$ to each finite set of vertices K in G, subject to the condition that $\xi_{K'} \subseteq \xi_K$ whenever $K' \supseteq K$. The set of all ends of G is denoted $\partial\mathscr{E}(G)$. The **ends compactification** $\mathscr{E}(G)$ of G is the topological space with underlying set $\partial\mathscr{E}(G) \cup V$ and with a basis of open sets given by finite subsets $K \subset V$ and by sets of the form $W \cup \{\xi \in \partial\mathscr{E}(G) : \xi_K = W\}$ where $K \subset V$ is finite and $W \subset V$ is a connected component of $G \setminus K$. The space of ends and ends compactification[2] of a topological space is defined similarly by replacing instances of the word 'finite' in the above definition with 'precompact'. Recall the definition of the metric space $\mathbb{G}$ from Section 2.4. If G is a network, the function $\mathbf{i} : V \to \mathbb{G}$ sending each vertex of G to its corresponding point of $\mathbb{G}$ extends to a continuous function $\hat{\mathbf{i}} : \mathscr{E}(G) \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ that restricts to a homeomorphism between $\partial\mathscr{E}(G)$ and $\partial\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$, see [16]. Several other equivalent constructions of the ends compactification and space of ends are possible, see [16] for a thorough treatment.

If $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a domain, the ends compactification $\mathscr{E}(D)$ can be defined equivalently and more explicitly as the quotient space $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}/\sim$, where $x \sim y$ if and only if $x = y$ or x and y belong to the same connected component of $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \setminus D$. We identify D with its image under the quotient $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \to \mathscr{E}(D)$, and write $\partial\mathscr{E}(D)$ for the space of ends $\partial\mathscr{E}(D) = \mathscr{E}(D) \setminus D$. A theorem of R.L. Moore [45] implies that $\mathscr{E}(D)$ is homeomorphic to the sphere for every domain D.

We define a **transboundary path** in G to be a continuous function $\gamma : I \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a closed interval of positive length. A transboundary path is said to be

[2]The ends 'compactification' of a general topological space need not be compact. However, the ends compactification of a connected, locally connected space is always compact.

a **transboundary cycle** if its endpoints coincide. We say that a transboundary path or cycle is **simple** if it is injective, with the possible exception of its endpoints.

It is easily verified that if $\phi : X \to Y$ is a proper continuous function between two topological spaces (that is, if $\phi^{-1}(K)$ is compact for every compact set $K \subseteq Y$), then ϕ extends uniquely to a continuous function $\hat{\phi} : \mathscr{E}(X) \to \mathscr{E}(Y)$. In particular, If $z : \mathbb{G} \to D$ is a proper embedding of G into D, then z extends to a continuous function $\hat{z} : \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G}) \to \mathscr{E}(D)$. Furthermore, if the plane network (G, z) has locally finite dual, then $\hat{z}$ restricts to a homeomorphism between $\partial\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ and $\partial\mathscr{E}(D)$. Thus, if γ is a simple transboundary path in G then $\hat{z} \circ \gamma$ is a simple path in $\mathscr{E}(D)$. If G has locally finite dual, then a set of edges $W \subseteq E$ is the trace of a simple transboundary path in G if and only if the closure of $\bigcup_{e \in W} z(I(e))$ is a simple curve in $\mathscr{E}(D)$.

We shall require the following Theorem of Diestel and Kühn [17].

Theorem 5.2 ([17, Theorem 2.6])**.** *Let G be a locally finite graph. Then every closed, connected subset of $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ is path-connected.*

The Jordan curve theorem, Moore's Theorem, and Theorem 5.2 imply the following.

Proposition 5.3. *Let G be a plane graph with locally finite dual $G^\dagger$ and let ω be a subgraph of G. Then ω is connected if and only if the closure of $\omega^\dagger$ in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G}^\dagger)$ does not contain the trace of a simple transboundary cycle. Moreover, if ω is not connected, then the closure of the* ***boundary***

$$\partial\omega = \left\{ e^\dagger \in E^\dagger : e \notin \omega \text{ and there exists an edge } e' \in \omega \text{ sharing an endpoint with } e \right\}$$

contains a simple transboundary cycle.

Thus, by reducing to the case in which $G^\dagger$ is locally finite as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we see that Theorem 1.8 is equivalent to the following theorem by duality.

Theorem 5.4. *Let G be a bounded codegree planar network with edge resistances bounded above that admits a locally finite embedding into a domain $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ with countably many boundary components. Then the closure in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ of the transboundary uniform spanning forest of G does not contain the trace of a simple transboundary cycle almost surely.*

In the terminology of [17], the conclusion of Theorem 5.4 states that the closure of the TUSF in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ is a.s. a topological spanning tree of $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$.

5.3 More on transboundary effective resistances

In order to prove Theorem 5.4, it is natural to attempt to estimate transboundary effective resistances after contracting and deleting infinite sets of edges. Unfortunately, such resistances are not well defined in general. For example, let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that both endpoints have first coordinate 0, and let $\mathcal{O}$ be the set of edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that both endpoints either have first coordinate 1 or -1. If we try to evaluate $\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}((-1,0),(1,0);(\mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O})$ by taking a limit of $\mathscr{R}_{\text{eff}}((-1,0),(1,0);(\mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathcal{C}_n)/\mathcal{O}_n)$, where $\mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{O}_n$ are exhaustions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}_n$ by finite sets, we find that the limit depends on the choice of exhaustions: if $\mathcal{C}_n$ grows much faster than $\mathcal{O}_n$ the limit will be infinity, while if $\mathcal{O}_n$ grows much faster than $\mathcal{C}_n$ the limit will be zero. To obtain a quantity that

will eventually be useful to prove Theorem 5.4, we define the *upper* transboundary effective resistances in a network under infinite contraction and deletion to be the maximum possible effective resistance obtained when contracting and deleting along an exhaustion by finite sets: By Rayleigh monotonicity, this maximum is obtained by first performing all the deletions and only then performing the contractions.

We now define the upper transboundary effective resistance formally. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ be disjoint sets of edges of G such that $G \setminus K$ is connected for all finite $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and let A and B be sets of vertices. For each finite set K_2 disjoint from $\mathcal{C}$, we define

$$\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}\big(A \leftrightarrow B; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2\big) = \sup_{K_1} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}\big(A \leftrightarrow B;\ (G-K_1)/K_2\big),$$

where K_1 is a finite subset of $\mathcal{C}$. We define the **upper transboundary effective resistance** from A to B in $(G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}\big(A \leftrightarrow B; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}\big) &= \inf_{K_2} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}\big(A \leftrightarrow B;\ (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2\big) \\ &= \inf_{K_2} \sup_{K_1} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}\big(A \leftrightarrow B;\ (G-K_1)/K_2\big),\end{aligned}$$

where K_2 is a finite subset of $\mathcal{O}$ and K_1 is a finite subset of $\mathcal{C}$. It follows from Rayleigh monotonicty[3] that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}\big(A \leftrightarrow B; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}\big) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}\big(A \leftrightarrow B;\ (G-\mathcal{C}_m)/\mathcal{O}_n\big) \\ &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G-\mathcal{C}_n)/\mathcal{O}_n) \qquad (5.4)\end{aligned}$$

whenever $\langle \mathcal{C}_m \rangle_{m\geq 1}$ and $\langle \mathcal{O}_n \rangle_{n\geq 1}$ are exhaustions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ by finite sets respectively.

In practice, we will not use the above definitions directly, but will instead appeal to Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.6 below.

5.3.1 Random transboundary paths

Given a transboundary path or cycle γ, let $E^{\rightarrow}(\gamma)$ be the set of oriented edges traversed in the positive direction by γ. For each probability measure ν on the space of simple transboundary paths in G, we define the energy $\mathcal{E}(\nu)$ of ν to be

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E^{\rightarrow}} c(e)^{-1} \big[\nu(e \in E^{\rightarrow}(\gamma)) - \nu(-e \in E^{\rightarrow}(\gamma))\big]^2.$$

More generally, suppose that ν is the law of a random path transboundary path $\gamma : I \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$. For every oriented edge e of G, we define $\theta_\nu(e)$ to be the difference between the expected number of times e is crossed by Γ in the positive direction and the expected number of times e is crossed by Γ in the negative direction if both of these expectations are finite, and otherwise set $\theta_\nu(e) = \infty$. We define

$$\mathcal{E}(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E^{\rightarrow}} c(e)^{-1} \theta_\nu(e)^2.$$

[3]Here we are using the fact that if $\langle a_{n,m} \rangle_{n,m\geq 1}$ is an array of real numbers such that $a_{n+1,m} \leq a_{n,m}$ and $a_{n,m+1} \geq a_{n,m}$ for all $n, m \geq 1$, then $\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} a_{n,m} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{m\to\infty} a_{n,m}$.

Given sets $A, B \subseteq \mathscr{E}(G)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subset E$, let $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A, B; G - \mathcal{C})$ be the set of transboundary paths from A to B in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ that do not traverse any edge of $\mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 5.5 (Method of random transboundary paths)**.** *Let G be an infinite network, and let $\mathcal{C} \subset E$ be such that $G - K$ is connected for every finite $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Then for each pair of sets $A, B \subseteq V$, we have*

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G - \mathcal{C}) \leq \inf\left\{\mathcal{E}(\nu) : \nu \text{ a probability measure on } \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A, B;\, G - \mathcal{C})\right\}.$$

Proof. First suppose that A and B are finite sets of vertices. Let $\langle V_n \rangle_{n \geq 1}$ be an exhaustion of G such that A and B are both contained in V_1. Suppose that ν is a probability measure on transboundary paths from A to B in G, and let γ be a random transboundary path from A to B in G with law ν that does not traverse any edges of $\mathcal{C}$. For each $n \geq 1$, let γ_n be the path from A to B in $G_n^{\#}$ formed by contracting the parts of γ contained in $\mathbb{G} \setminus V_n$. Writing ν_n for the law of γ_n, we have that $\theta_\nu(e) = \theta_{\nu_n}(e)$ if either endpoint of e is in V_n, and $\theta_{\nu_n} = 0$ otherwise. It follows that $\mathcal{E}(\nu_n) \leq \mathcal{E}(\nu)$ and hence

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G - K) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathscr{R}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G_n^{\#} - K) \leq \mathcal{E}(\nu). \tag{5.5}$$

for all $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ finite by the method of random paths for finite graphs (see [40] for the method of random paths with non-simple paths in finite graphs). The general case follows by taking exhaustions of A and B by finite sets. □

By applying Theorem 5.2, it is possible to show that this inequality is in fact an equality. However, since we are only interested in upper bounds anyway, we avoid proving this by introducing the following notaional sleight of hand. For each pair of Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathscr{E}(G)$ and each $\mathcal{C} \subset E$ is such that $G - K_1$ is connected for every finite $K_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we define

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G - \mathcal{C}) := \inf\left\{\mathcal{E}(\nu) : \nu \text{ a probability measure on } \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A, B;\, G - \mathcal{C})\right\}.$$

We also define

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) := \inf_{K_2} \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G - \mathcal{C})/K_2)$$

for all Borel subsets $A, B \subseteq \mathscr{E}(G)$ whenever $\mathcal{C}$ is as above and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq E$ is disjoint from $\mathcal{C}$. Proposition 5.5 implies that $\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) \geq \mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O})$ when A and B are sets of vertices.

The following lemma is similar to [19, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 5.6. *Let $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subseteq \mathscr{E}(G)$ be Borel, and let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ be disjoint sets of edges of G such that $G \setminus K$ is connected for all finite subsets $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{3}\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) &\leq \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) \\ &\quad + \sup_{\xi, \xi' \in A_2} \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \xi'; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) + \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_2 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Given a measure ν on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A, B; G - \mathcal{C})$ and a finite set K disjoint from $\mathcal{C}$, define

$$\mathcal{E}^K(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E^{\rightarrow} \setminus K} c(e)^{-1} \theta_v(e)^2.$$

By extending paths in $(G-\mathcal{C})/K$ to form paths in $G-\mathcal{C}$ and contracting paths in $G-\mathcal{C}$ to form paths in $(G-\mathcal{C})/K$, we see that

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G-\mathcal{C})/K) = \inf\left\{\mathcal{E}^K(\nu) : \nu \text{ a probability measure on } \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A,B;\, G-\mathcal{C})\right\}.$$

Let $K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ be finite, and let $\varepsilon > 0$.

- Let γ_1 be a random transboundary path in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A_1, A_2;\, G-\mathcal{C})$ with law ν_1 such that $\mathcal{E}^{K_1}(\nu_1) \le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2;\, (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) + \varepsilon$,
- let γ_3 be a random transboundary path in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A_2, A_3;\, G-\mathcal{C})$ with law ν_3 such that $\mathcal{E}^{K_1}(\nu_3) \le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3;\, (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) + \varepsilon$, and
- for each ξ and ξ' in A_2, let $\gamma_{\xi,\xi'}$ be a random transboundary path in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(\xi, \xi';\, G-\mathcal{C})$ with law $\nu_{\xi,\xi'}$ such that $\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_{\xi,\xi'}) \le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3;\, (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2) + \varepsilon$.

Let γ_1, γ_2, and $\gamma_{\xi,\xi'}$ for all $\xi, \xi' \in A_2$ all be defined on the same probability space (the choice of coupling will not be important). Let $\xi(\gamma_1)$ be the endpoint of γ_1, let $\xi(\gamma_3)$ be the starting point of γ_3, and let $\gamma_2 = \gamma_{\xi(\gamma_1),\xi(\gamma_3)}$. Finally, let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}(A_1, A_3, G-\mathcal{C})$ be the concatenation of the paths γ_1, γ_2 and γ_3. Let ν be the law of γ, let ν_2 be the law of γ_2, and let $\mathbb{E}$ denote the expectation with respect to the joint law of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ and γ. Jensen's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_2) &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{e \in E \setminus K_2} c(e)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\theta_{\nu_{\xi(\gamma_1),\xi(\gamma_3)}}(e)]^2 \le \mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_{\xi(\gamma_1),\xi(\gamma_3)}) \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi(\gamma_1) \leftrightarrow \xi(\gamma_3); (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2)\right] + \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have that $\theta_\nu(e) = \theta_{\nu_1}(e) + \theta_{\nu_2}(e) + \theta_{\nu_3}(e)$ for all $e \in E^{\rightarrow}$, so that

$$\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu) \le 3\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_1) + 3\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_2) + 3\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_3) \le 3\mathcal{E}^{K_1}(\nu_1) + 3\mathcal{E}^{K_2}(\nu_2) + 3\mathcal{E}^{K_1}(\nu_3)$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{3}\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2\right) &\le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\xi(\gamma_1) \leftrightarrow \xi(\gamma_2); (G-\mathcal{C})/K_2\right)\right] + \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(A_2 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1\right) + 3\varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

Taking a limit as K_2 exhausts $\mathcal{O}$, the Monotone Convergence Theorem yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{3}\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) &\le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\xi(\gamma_1) \leftrightarrow \xi(\gamma_2); (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}\right)\right] + \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_2 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) + 3\varepsilon \quad (5.6)\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{3}\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) &\le \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) \\ &+ \sup_{\xi,\xi'} \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \xi'; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) + \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A_2 \leftrightarrow A_3; (G-\mathcal{C})/K_1) + 3\varepsilon. \quad (5.7)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the claim follows by taking a limit on the right-hand side of (5.7) as K_1 exhausts $\mathcal{O}$. □



FIGURE 6. Left: A type I interior boundary component. Centre and right: Type II interior boundary components.

As in Lemma 2.4, we can also get upper bounds on transboundary effective resistances using random sets: if A and B are Borel subsets of $\mathscr{E}(G)$ and μ is the law of a random subset W of V such that the closure in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ of the subgraph of G induced by W contains a path from A to B in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$, then

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(A \leftrightarrow B; G) \leq \sup_{e\in E} c(e)^{-1}\mathcal{E}(\mu) := \sup_{e\in E} c(e)^{-1} \sum_{v\in V} \mu(v \in W)^2. \tag{5.8}$$

The proof is the same as that of Lemma 2.4.

5.4 Proof of Theorem 5.4

As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, it suffices to consider the case that G is simple and does not contain a peninsula. Let T be the triangulation obtained from G as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let P be a circle packing of T in a circle domain D (which exists by [25, Theorem 0.3]), and let z be the associated embedding of G into D. By applying a Möbius transformation if necessary, we may assume that $\infty \in D$. We write $\preceq$, $\succeq$ and $\asymp$ for inequalities or equalities that hold up to positive multiplicative constants depending only on $\sup_{f\in F} \deg(f)$ and $\sup_{e\in E} c(e)^{-1}$.

Let $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ be a simple transboundary path. We say that $b \in \partial\mathscr{E}(D)$ is an **interior boundary component of** γ if there exists a time $t \in (0,1)$ such that $\hat{z}\circ\gamma(t) = b$. Given $b = \hat{z}\circ\gamma(t)$, let ∂b_- and ∂b_+ to be the closed, connected sets of points in ∂b that are accumulation points of $\hat{z}\circ\gamma(s)$ as s tends to t from below and above respectively. That is,

$$\partial b_- = \left\{z \in \partial b : \text{for every } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ there exists } s \in [t-\varepsilon, t) \text{ such that } |z(\gamma(s)) - z| < \varepsilon\right\}$$
$$\partial b_+ = \left\{z \in \partial b : \text{for every } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ there exists } s \in (t, t+\varepsilon] \text{ such that } |z(\gamma(s)) - z| < \varepsilon\right\}.$$

We say that an interior boundary component b of γ is **type I** if it is not a point, ∂b_- and ∂b_+ are both proper subsets of ∂b, and the counterclockwise endpoint of ∂b_- is not contained in ∂b_+. Otherwise we say that b is a **type II** interior boundary component. See Figure 6 for examples.

Given a simple transboundary cycle γ, let $\mathfrak{L}(\gamma)$ and $\mathfrak{R}(\gamma)$ be the open sets in $\mathscr{E}(D)$ to the left and to the right of γ respectively (which are well defined by Moore's theorem and the Jordan Curve Theorem), and let $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\gamma)$ be the sets of edges of G whose images under z are contained in $\mathfrak{L}(\gamma)$ and $\mathfrak{R}(\gamma)$ respectively.

Lemma 5.7 (Resistance analysis at a single interior boundary component)**.** *Let $\gamma : [h,l] \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ be a simple transboundary path in G, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a subset of E such that γ does not pass through any edges of $\mathcal{C}$, $G \setminus K$ is connected for every finite subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and there exists an interval $I' \supseteq I$ and a simple transboundary cycle $\gamma' : I' \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ with $\gamma'|_I = \gamma$ such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\gamma')$. Let $t \in (h,l)$ be such that $\hat{z} \circ \gamma(t)$ is an interior boundary component of γ, let $\hat{\Gamma}_1$ be the union of the set of vertices visited by $\gamma|_{[h,t]}$ and the set of type I interior boundary components of $\gamma|_{[h,t]}$, and let $\hat{\Gamma}_2$ be the union of the set of vertices visited by $\gamma|_{[t,l]}$ and the set of type I interior boundary components of $\gamma|_{[t,l]}$. Then the following hold.*

(1) If $\hat{z} \circ \gamma(t)$ is a type I interior boundary component of γ, then

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_1 \leftrightarrow \gamma(t); G - \mathcal{C}\right) = \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_2 \leftrightarrow \gamma(t); G - \mathcal{C}\right) = \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_2 \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_2; G - \mathcal{C}\right) = 0.$$

(2) If $\hat{z} \circ \gamma(t)$ is a type II interior boundary component of γ, then

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_1 \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_2; G - \mathcal{C}\right) = 0.$$

Proof. The analysis is similar to that of Theorem 1.2. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, let the sets $V_{z_0}(r, 2r)$ and $W_{z_0}(r)$ be as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $b = \hat{z}(\gamma(t))$. If b is a singleton in $\mathbb{C}$, let z_0 be the point $b = \{z_0\}$. If b is not a singleton but $\partial b_- = b$, we choose z_0 arbitrarily from ∂b. Otherwise, ∂b_- is a proper subinterval of ∂b, and we choose z_0 to be the counterclockwise endpoint of this interval. This ensures that z_0 is in the closure of both $\hat{\Gamma}_1$ and $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}(\gamma')$.

First suppose that b is a type I boundary point. Let $r > 0$, and consider the circle $\mathfrak{C}(r) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| = r\}$. The definition of z_0 ensures that there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that for every positive $r \leq r_1$ there exists a unique arc of $\mathfrak{C}(r)$, denoted $\mathfrak{A}(r)$, that begins in $\hat{z} \circ \gamma'([a,t))$, ends at b, is contained in $\hat{z} \circ \gamma([a,t)) \cup \mathfrak{R} \cup b$, and does not pass through any of the circles of P corresponding to vertices contained in $\hat{z} \circ \gamma((t,l])$. We observe that for Lebesgue-a.e. $r \leq r_1$, the starting point of $\mathfrak{A}(r)$ is not a type II interior boundary component of γ. Indeed, for each type II interior boundary component b' that is not a singleton, the only point of b' that might be possible to be access by a circular arc contained in $\mathfrak{R}$ is the counterclockwise endpoint of ∂b_-. Taking these points together with the singleton interior boundary components yields a countable collection of points, none of which are contained in $\mathfrak{C}(r)$ for a.e. $r \leq r_1$. Thus, for a.e. $r \leq r_1$, the set of vertices of T whose circles intersect the arc $\mathfrak{A}(r)$ is the trace of a simple transboundary path from $\hat{\Gamma}_1$ to b in $\mathscr{E}(T)$; diverting this path clockwise around each face of G as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 yields a transboundary path from $\hat{\Gamma}_1$ to b in $\mathscr{E}(G)$ that is contained in the closure of $W_{z_0}(r)$ and that does not pass through any edge in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$.

Otherwise, b is a type II interior boundary component. In this case, a similar analysis shows that there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that, for a.e. positive $r \leq r_1$, the set $W_{z_0}(r)$ contains a transboundary path in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ that starts in $\hat{\Gamma}_1$, ends in $\hat{\Gamma}_2$, and that does not pass through any edge of $\mathcal{C}$.

Let r_1 be as above and define $\langle r_n \rangle_{n \geq 2}$ recursively by

$$r_n = \inf\{r \geq r_{n-1} : V_{z_0}(r, 2r) \cap V_{z_0}(r_{n-1}, 2r_{n-1}) = \emptyset\}.$$

The positivity of this infimum follows from a similar argument to Lemma 3.4. Let U be a uniform random variable on the interval $[1,2]$ and, for each $r>0$, let μ_r be the law of the random set $W_{z_0}(Ur) = V_{z_0}(Ur, Ur)$, which is always contained in $V_{z_0}(r,2r)$. The proof of Lemma 3.3 also yields that $\mathcal{E}(\mu_r) \preceq 1$ for all $r>0$. We deduce that, by (5.8),

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\hat{\Gamma}_1 \leftrightarrow \gamma(t); G-\mathcal{C}) \preceq \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_{r_i}\right) \preceq \frac{1}{n} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

if b is a type I interior boundary component and that

$$\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\hat{\Gamma}_1 \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_2; G-\mathcal{C}) \preceq \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_{r_i}\right) \preceq \frac{1}{n} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$$

if b is a type II interior boundary component. The remaining claims in item (1) follow respectively, by symmetry and by taking $A_1 = \hat{\Gamma}_1, A_2 = \{\gamma(t)\}, A_3 = \hat{\Gamma}_2$ and $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ in (**??**). □

Proposition 5.8 (Whole path resistance analysis via induction)**.** *Let $\gamma : [h,l] \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ be a simple transboundary path in G, and let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ be disjoint subsets of E such that $G-K$ is connected for every finite subset $K \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and the trace of γ is contained in the closure of $\mathcal{O}$. Suppose further that there exists an interval $I' \supseteq I$ and a simple transboundary cycle $\gamma' : I' \to \mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$ with $\gamma'|_I = \gamma$ such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\gamma')$. Let $\hat{\Gamma}$ be the union of the set of vertices visited by γ and the type I interior boundary components of γ. Then, for every $\xi, \zeta \in \hat{\Gamma}$,*

$$\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \zeta; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) = \mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \zeta; (G-\mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O}) = 0.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.8 uses a transfinite induction inspired by He and Schramm's work on the Koebe conjecture [25, 51]. For background on ordinals and transfinite induction, see e.g. [30].

Proof. Let $B(D)$ be the set of connected components of $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} - D$, which we identify with the space of ends $\partial\mathscr{E}(D)$ of D. For each ordinal $\alpha \geq 0$, we define $B_\alpha(D) \subseteq B(D)$ recursively as follows.

(1) Let $B_0(D) = B(D)$.
(2) For each ordinal $\alpha \geq 1$, let $B_{\alpha+1}(D) = B_\alpha(D) \setminus \{\text{isolated points of } B_\alpha(D)\}$.
(3) For each limit ordinal α, let $B_\alpha(D) = \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} B_\beta(D)$.

Suppose that $B(D)$ is countable. The Baire Category Theorem implies that every compact countable Hausdorff space has at least one isolated point, so that, for each ordinal α, either $B_\alpha(D) = \emptyset$ or the set $B_{\alpha+1}(D)$ is strictly contained in $B_\alpha(D)$. It follows that there exists some smallest ordinal, denoted $\mathrm{rank}(D)$, such that $B_{\mathrm{rank}(D)}(D) = \emptyset$. For each interior boundary component $b \in B(D)$, we define $\mathrm{rank}(b)$ to be the smallest ordinal α such that $b \notin B_\alpha(D)$. Note that $\mathrm{rank}(D) = \sup_{b\in B(D)} \mathrm{rank}(b)$, and that $\mathrm{rank}(b)$ is a successor ordinal for each $b \in B(D)$. The rank function has the following property:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{For every infinite set } A \subseteq B(D), \text{ there exists a finite set } A_0 \subseteq A\\ &\text{and a point } b \in \overline{A} \text{ such that } \mathrm{rank}(b) > \sup\{\mathrm{rank}(b') : b' \in A \setminus A_0\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

We also define $\mathrm{rank}(z) = 0$ for $z \in D$, and let $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ be the ordinal

$$\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) = \sup\big\{\mathrm{rank}(\gamma(t)) : t \in (h,l)\big\}.$$

Then $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) \leq \mathrm{rank}(D)$ and $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) = 0$ if and only if $\gamma|_{(h,l)}$ is a simple path in G. The proof proceeds by transfinite induction on $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$. The base case $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) = 0$ is trivial. Suppose that γ is a simple transboundary path with $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) \geq 1$, and that the proposition holds for all simple transboundary paths γ' with $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma') < \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $[h,l] = [0,1]$.

First suppose that $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ is a limit ordinal. In this case, $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma(t))$ is strictly less than $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ for every $t \in (0,1)$. Moreover, for every $0 < s \leq t < 1$, we must have that $\sup_{s\leq l\leq t} \mathrm{rank}(\gamma(l)) < \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$, since otherwise there would exist $s \leq l \leq t$ such that $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma(l)) \geq \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ by compactness of $[s,t]$ and (5.9). Thus, the restriction $\gamma|_{[s,t]}$ has $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma|_{[s,t]}) < \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$. Given two points ξ and ζ in $\hat{\Gamma}$, let s and t be such that $\gamma(s) = \xi$ and $\gamma(t) = \zeta$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $s < t$, in which case applying the induction hypothesis to $\gamma|_{[s/2,(1+t)/2]}$ yields the claim (this works even if $s = 0$ or $t = 1$, in which case one of the points ξ, ζ must be a vertex, and hence either $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma|_{[0,(1+t)/2]}) < \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ or $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma|_{[s/2,1]}) < \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ as appropriate).

Now suppose that $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma) \geq 1$ is a successor ordinal. In this case, the set of times t such that $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma(t)) = \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ is non-empty and, by compactness of $[0,1]$ and (5.9), accumulates to a (possibly empty) subset of $\{0,1\}$. Thus, there exists an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and a collection of times $\{t_i : i \in I\} \subset (0,1)$ such that $t_i < t_j$ if and only if $i < j$ and $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma(t)) = \mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$ if and only if $t = t_i$ for some $i \in I$. If $i_+ = \sup\{i \in I\} + 1$ is finite, set $t_{i_+} = 1$. Similarly, if $i_- = \inf\{i \in I\} - 1$ is finite, set $t_{i_-} = 0$. Let $\gamma_i = \gamma|_{[t_i,t_{i+1}]}$ for each $i \in I \cup \{i_-\}$, so that γ is the concatenation of the sequence of paths $\langle \gamma_i : i \in I \cup \{i_-\}\rangle$, each of which has rank strictly less than $\mathrm{rank}(\gamma)$.

Let $\hat{\Gamma}_i$ be the union of the vertices visited by γ_i and the type I interior boundary components of γ_i. For the rest of this proof, we will simplify notation by writing $\mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(A \leftrightarrow B)$ to denote $\mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(A \leftrightarrow B; (G - \mathcal{C})/\mathcal{O})$. Lemma 5.6 yields that

$$\frac{1}{3}\mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_j) \leq \mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_k) + \sup_{\xi,\xi' \in \hat{\Gamma}_k} \mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\xi \leftrightarrow \xi') + \mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\hat{\Gamma}_k \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_j).$$

for all $i,j,k \in I \cup \{i_-\}$. The centre term is zero for all $k \in I \cup \{i_-\}$ by the induction hypothesis, and so applying Lemma 5.7 (and Rayleigh monotonicty) and inducting on $|i - j|$ yields that

$$\mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_j) = 0 \tag{5.10}$$

for all $i,j \in I \cup \{i_-\}$. A similar analysis, again applying Lemma 5.7, Lemma 5.6, Rayleigh monotonicty, and the induction hypothesis yields that

$$\mathscr{P}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \gamma(t_j)) = 0 \tag{5.11}$$

for all $i \in I \cup \{i_-\}$ and $j \in I$ such that $\hat{z} \circ \gamma(t_j)$ is a type I interior boundary component.

Let $\xi \in \hat{\Gamma}$. Then we have that either $\xi \in \hat{\Gamma}_i$ for some $i \in I \cup \{i_-\}$ or that $\xi = \gamma(t_i)$ for some $i \in I$. Similarly, we have either that $\zeta \in \hat{\Gamma}_j$ for some $j \in I \cup \{i_-\}$ or that $\zeta = \gamma(t_j)$ for some $i \in I$. In each of these cases, it can be deduced from (5.10), (5.11), Lemma 5.6,

and the induction hypothesis that $\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \zeta) = 0$. For instance, if $\xi \in \hat{\Gamma}_i$ and $\zeta \in \hat{\Gamma}_j$ for some $i, j \in I \cup \{i_-\}$, then applying Lemma 5.6 twice yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \zeta) &\le 3\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_i) + \sup_{\xi',\xi'' \in \hat{\Gamma}_i} 3\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi' \leftrightarrow \xi'') + 3\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \zeta) \\ &\le 3\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_i) + \sup_{\xi',\xi'' \in \hat{\Gamma}_i} 3\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi' \leftrightarrow \xi'') + 9\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\hat{\Gamma}_i \leftrightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_j) \\ &\qquad + \sup_{\zeta',\zeta'' \in \hat{\Gamma}_j} 9\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\zeta'' \leftrightarrow \zeta') + +9\mathscr{P}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(\hat{\Gamma}_j \leftrightarrow \zeta).\end{aligned}$$

The first and last terms are trivially zero, the second and fourth terms are zero by the induction hypothesis, and the third term is zero by (5.10). The remaining cases are similar. □

Note that if $\mathfrak{F}$ is the TUSF of a network G, the complement $E \setminus \mathfrak{F}$ has the property that $G - K$ is connected for every finite set $K \subseteq E \setminus \mathfrak{F}$.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the TUSF of G. For each edge $e = (x, y)$ let $\mathscr{A}^e$ be the event that there exists a simple transboundary path from x to y in the closure of $\mathfrak{F} \setminus \{e\}$ in $\mathscr{E}(\mathbb{G})$. It suffices to prove that $\mathsf{TUSF}(e \in \mathfrak{F} \mid \mathscr{A}^e) = 0$ for every oriented edge e of G. Recall our assumption that $\infty \in D$. For each n, let V_n be the finite set of vertices v of G such that $d_{\mathbb{C}}(z(v), \partial D) \ge 1/n$ and let $G^{\#}_n$ be the finite network obtained from G by contracting each connected component of $V \setminus V_n$ to a point and deleting all of the self-loops that are created. We identify the edges of $G^{\#}_n$ with the edge of G that have at least one endpoint in V_n. Let $\mathfrak{F}_n$ be the subgraph of $G^{\#}_n$ consisting of those edges of $G^{\#}_n$ that are open in $\mathfrak{F}$ (note that $\mathfrak{F}_n$ is *not* the UST of $G^{\#}_n$ and may contain cycles). Let $\mathscr{A}^e_n$ be the event that x and y are in the same component of $\mathfrak{F}_n \setminus \{e\}$. Note that $\mathscr{A}^e_{n+1} \subseteq \mathscr{A}^e_n$ for all $n \ge 1$ and that $\mathscr{A}^e \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathscr{A}^e_n$. (It can be shown using Theorem 5.2 that this inclusion is an equality.)

On the event $\mathscr{A}^e_n$, let η_n be the left-most path from y to x in $\mathfrak{F}_n \setminus \{e\}$. That is, η_n is the unique path from y to x in $G^{\#}_n$ that is contained in $\mathfrak{F}_n \setminus \{e\}$ and such that the region of $G^{\#}_n$ to the left of the cycle formed by concatenating e with η (including the the cycle itself) does not contain any other paths from y to x in $\mathfrak{F}_n \setminus \{e\}$. Let K^n be the union of η_n together with the set of edges contained in the region to the left of the cycle formed by concatenating e with η_n on the event $\mathscr{A}^e_n$, and otherwise let $K^n = E$. Then K^n is a local set for $\mathfrak{F}$, and hence $\tilde{K}^n = \bigcup_{i \le n} K^i$ is also a local set for $\mathfrak{F}$. Moreover, the event $\mathscr{A}^e_n$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{K^n}$ and hence with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{K}^n}$. By the strong spatial Markov property and Kirchoff's Effective Resistance Formula, we therefore have that

$$\mathsf{TUSF}(e \in \mathfrak{F} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{K}^n}, \mathscr{A}^e_n) = c(e)\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(x \leftrightarrow y; (G \setminus \tilde{K}^n_c)/\tilde{K}^n_o),$$

where $\tilde{K}^n_o$ are the edges of $\tilde{K}^n$ that are contained in $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\tilde{K}^n_c = \tilde{K}^n \setminus K^n_o$. Let $\tilde{K} = \bigcup_{n \ge 1} \tilde{K}^n$ and define $\tilde{K}^n_o$ and $\tilde{K}^n_c$ as before. The Martingale Convergence Theorem and (5.4) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{TUSF}\Big(e \in \mathfrak{F} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{K}}, \bigcap_{n \ge 0} \mathscr{A}^e_n\Big) &= \lim_{n \to \infty} c(e)\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}}_{\mathrm{eff}}(x \leftrightarrow y; (G \setminus \tilde{K}^n_c)/\tilde{K}^n_o) \qquad \text{a.s.} \\ &\le c(e)\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{Tr}^*}_{\mathrm{eff}}(x \leftrightarrow y; (G \setminus \tilde{K}_c)/\tilde{K}_o).\end{aligned}$$



FIGURE 7. A drawing of $T_2 \times K_2$ in the plane. The graph G_d is obtained from $T_d \times K_2$ by contracting and deleting edges.

On the event $\bigcap_{n\geq 0} \mathscr{A}_n^e$, the boundary of $\tilde{K}$ contains a simple transboundary path from y to x by Proposition 5.3. Applying Proposition 5.8 to this path with $\mathcal{C} = \tilde{K}_c$, $\mathcal{O} = \tilde{K}_o$ and γ' the concatenation of γ with e yields that

$$\mathsf{TUSF}(e \in \mathfrak{F} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{K}}, \mathscr{A}^e) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

concluding the proof. □

5.5 Proof of Theorem 1.7

Let $d \geq 2$ be a natural number, and let $T_d = (V, E)$ be a d-ary tree drawn in the plane, with root vertex ρ. For each vertex u of T_d we write $|u|$ for the distance between u and ρ in T_d. For each $N \geq 0$, let L_N denote the set of vertices at distance N from ρ, and let $V_N = \bigcup_{n=0}^N L_N$ denote the set of vertices at distance at most N from ρ. For each N, we label the d^N vertices of L_N by $1, \dots, d^N$ from left to right. Let the set $M \subset V$ consist of those vertices of T_d that are in L_{2^k} for some natural number $k \geq 1$ and have labels of the form $id^{2^{k-1}}$ where i is an integer ranging between 1 and $d^{2^{k-1}}$.

Let G_d be the graph obtained by taking two disjoint copies $T_d \times \{0\}$ and $T_d \times \{1\}$ of T_d, and identifying the two vertices $(v, 0)$ and $(v, 1)$ if and only if v belongs to M. Since G_d can be obtained from the planar graph $T_d \times K_2$ (where K_2 is a single edge, see Figure 7) by deleting and contracting edges, it follows that that G_d is planar.

Theorem 5.9. *There exists some d_0 such that for all $d \geq d_0$, the free uniform spanning forest of G_d is disconnected with positive probability.*

For each N, let G_d^N be the subgraph of G_d induced by $V_N \times \{0, 1\}$. Recall that $\mathbf{P}_{(v,i)}^{G_d^N}$ denotes the law of a simple random walk on G_d^N started at (v, i).

Lemma 5.10. *Let v be a vertex of T_d, let u be a child of v, and let $N \geq 8|u|$. Then*

$$\mathbf{P}_{(u,0)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(v,1)} < \tau_{(v,0)}\right) \geq \frac{d-1}{6d}.$$

Proof. We will show that the random walk visits a vertex of M before reaching $(v,0)$ or $(v,1)$ with probability at least $(d-1)/3d$; once the random walk visits a vertex of M, the probability of reaching $(v,0)$ before $(v,1)$ is $1/2$ by symmetry.

If $u \in M$ we are done, so assume not. Let k be minimal such that $2^k \geq |u|$, so that $N \geq 2^{k+3}$. It is well-known and to calculate that the probability that a random walk on a $(d+1)$-regular tree never visits a chosen neighbor of the starting point is $(d-1)/d$. Indeed, if p is the probability that it *does* visit the chosen neighbor, then the Markov property yields the relation $p = (d+1)^{-1} + p^2 d(d+1)^{-1}$. Thus, with probability at least $(d-1)/d$, the random walk on G_d^N started at $(u,0)$ either visits M or reaches $L_{2^{k+1}} \times \{0\}$ before visiting $(v,0)$. Each vertex in $L_{2^{k+1}}$ has exactly one descendant in $L_{2^{k+2}}$ that belongs to M and so, conditional on the walk reaching $L_{2^{k+1}}$ before hitting $(v,0)$, the probability that the walk visits M before $(v,0)$ is at least $1/3$ by gambler's ruin. □

Proof of Theorem 5.9. We will show that the length of the path between $(\rho,0)$ and $(\rho,1)$ in the UST of G_d^N is *not* a tight sequence, so that in the limit $(\rho,0)$ is not connected to $(\rho,1)$ with positive probability. By Wilson's algorithm, the path between $(\rho,0)$ and $(\rho,1)$ in the UST of G_d^N is distributed as the loop-erasure of a random walk from $(\rho,0)$ stopped when it first visits $(\rho,1)$. Lawler [35] gave an alternative description of this random path, which we now describe. Given a finite connected graph G and two vertices x and y of G, we construct a random simple path η from x to y as follows. Start by setting $\eta_0 = x$. Given the first n steps of the path $\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_n$, sample η_{n+1} from the distribution

$$\mathbb{P}^G(\eta_{n+1} = u \mid \eta_0, \ldots, \eta_n) \propto \mathbb{1}(u \sim \eta_n)\mathbf{P}_u^G(\text{visit } y \text{ before } \{\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_n\}).$$

We stop the first time we visit y. This process is referred to as the **Laplacian random walk**, and was originally introduced by Lyklema and Evertsz [39].

We now return to the setting of Theorem 5.9. Given a finite simple path η from $(\rho,0)$ to $(\rho,1)$ in G_d^N, we define the **prefix** of η to be the path $\langle(\eta_0)_1, \ldots, (\eta_k)_1\rangle$, where k is the smallest number such that $(\eta_i)_1 \in M$.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $\langle x_i\rangle_{i=0}^n$ be a finite simple path starting at ρ in T_d, let u be a child of x_n, and let $N \geq 8(n+1)$. Then, letting x denote the trace $\{x_i : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$ of $\langle x_i\rangle_{i=0}^n$,*

$$\frac{d-1}{6d}\mathbf{P}_{(v,1)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(\rho,1)} < \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right) \leq \mathbf{P}_{(u,0)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(\rho,1)} \leq \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right) \leq \mathbf{P}_{(v,1)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(\rho,1)} \leq \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right). \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. Let u be a child of x_n in T_d. In order for the random walk started at $(u,0)$ to hit $(\rho,1)$ before $x \times \{0\}$ it must first hit $(v,1)$. By the strong Markov property

$$\mathbf{P}_{(u,0)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(\rho,1)} \leq \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right) = \mathbf{P}_{(u,0)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(v,1)} \leq \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right)\mathbf{P}_{(v,1)}^{G_d^N}\left(\tau_{(\rho,1)} \leq \tau_{x\times\{0\}}\right).$$

The upper bound of (5.12) follows immediately, while the lower bound follows from Lemma 5.10. □

Let γ be the prefix of the Laplacian random walk η. Lemma 5.11 implies that for any path $\rho = x_0, \ldots, x_n$ in T_d starting at ρ and every child u of x_n,

$$\mathbb{P}^{G_d^N}\left(\eta_{n+1} = (u,0) \mid \eta_0 = (\rho,0),\, \eta_1 = (x_1,0),\, \ldots,\, \eta_n = (x_n,0)\right) \leq \frac{1}{d}\left(\frac{6d}{d-1}\right) = \frac{6}{d-1}$$

provided $N \geq 8(n+1)$. It follows that for any path $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in T_d starting at ρ,

$$\mathbb{P}^{G_d^N}(\gamma_1 = x_1, \dots, \gamma_n = x_n) \leq \left(\frac{6}{d-1}\right)^n$$

for every $N \geq 8(n+1)$. The path γ ends at a vertex of M by definition, and so its length must be 2^k for some integer $k \geq 1$. Of the d^{2^k} vertices in L_{2^k}, only $d^{2^{k-1}}$ of these are vertices of M, so that

$$\mathbb{P}^{G_d^N}(\gamma \text{ has length } 2^k) \leq d^{2^{k-1}} \left(\frac{6}{d-1}\right)^{2^k}$$

for every $N \geq 2^{k+3} + 8$. Summing over k, we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{UST}_{G_d^N}&\big(\text{the path from } (\rho,0) \text{ to } (\rho,1) \text{ in } T \text{ has length at most } 2^m\big) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^{G_d^N}(\gamma \text{ has length at most } 2^m) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} d^{2^{k-1}} \left(\frac{6}{d-1}\right)^{2^k}\end{aligned}$$

for every $N \geq 2^{m+3} + 8$. Taking the limit first as $N \to \infty$ and then as $m \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathsf{FUSF}_{G_d}\left((\rho,0) \text{ connected to } (\rho,1) \text{ in } \mathfrak{F}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} d^{2^{k-1}} \left(\frac{6}{d-1}\right)^{2^k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{6\sqrt{d}}{d-1}\right)^{2^k},$$

which is less than one when d is sufficiently large ($d \geq 64$ is sufficient). □

6 Closing Remarks and Open Problems

6.1 Remarks

Remark 6.1 (Non-universality in the parabolic case.). Unlike in the CP hyperbolic case, the exponents governing the behaviour of the USTs of CP parabolic, simple, 3-connected proper plane graphs with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry are not universal, and need not exist in general.

Indeed, consider the double circle packing of the proper plane quadrangulation with underlying graph $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$, pictured in Figure 8. Let the packing be normalised to be symmetric under rotation by $\pi/2$ about the origin and to have $r(0,0) = 1$. It is possible to compute that $r(i,j) = (3+2\sqrt{2})^i$ and hence that $|z(i,j)|$ is comparable to $(3+2\sqrt{2})^i$ for every $(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$. Suppose that the edges connecting (i,j) to $(i \pm 1, j)$ are given weight 1 for every $(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$, while the edges connecting (i,j) to $(i, j \pm 1)$ are given weight c for each $(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$. It can be computed that the probability that a walk started at $(i,0)$ hits $(0,0)$ without ever changing its second coordinate is $a(c)^i := (1 + c - \sqrt{c^2+2c})^i$. Let $e = ((0,0),(0,1))$. By running Wilson's algorithm rooted at $(0,0)$ starting from the



FIGURE 8. The double circle packing of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$.

vertices $(i,0)$ and $(i,1)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{UST}\left(\mathrm{past}_T(e) \cap \{i\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \neq \emptyset\right) &\geq \mathbf{P}_{(i,0)}(\tau_{(0,0)} < \tau_{\mathbb{N}\times\{1,2,3\}})\mathbf{P}_{(i,1)}(\tau_{(0,1)} < \tau_{\mathbb{N}\times\{0,2,3\}}) \\ &\qquad \cdot \mathbf{P}_{(0,1)}(X_1 = (0,0)) \\ &= \frac{c}{2c+1}a(c)^{2i}.\end{aligned}$$

the right-hand side is exactly the probability that the random walk from $(i,0)$ hits $(0,0)$ without ever changing its second coordinate, and that the random walk from $(i,1)$ hits $(0,1)$ without ever changing its second coordinate and then steps to $(0,0)$.

Let $q(c)$ be the probability that a random walk started at (i,j) visits every vertex of $\{i\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ before changing its vertical coordinate, which tends to one as $c \to \infty$. Let Y be a loop-erased random walk from $(0,0)$. It can be computed that the probability that a random walk started from (i,j) visits $\{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ before hitting the trace of Y is at most $b(c)^i := (1-q(c))^i$. Thus, by Wilson's algorithm and a union bound,

$$\mathsf{UST}(\mathrm{past}_T(e) \cap \{i\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \neq \emptyset) \leq 4b(c)^i.$$

It follows that there exist positive constants $k(c)$, $\alpha(c)$ and $\beta(c)$ such that $\alpha(c) \to 0$ as $c \to 0$, $\beta(c) \to \infty$ as $c \to \infty$, and

$$k(c)^{-1}R^{-\alpha(c)} \leq \mathsf{UST}\left(\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{past}_T(e)) \geq R\right) \leq k(c)R^{-\beta(c)}.$$

Thus, by varying c, we obtain CP parabolic proper plane networks with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry with different exponents governing the diameter of the pasts of edges in their USTs: If c is large the diameter has a light tail, while if c is small the diameter has a heavy tail. Furthermore, by varying the weight of $((i,j),(i,j\pm 1))$ as a function of i in the above example (i.e., making c small at some scales and large at others), it is possible to construct a simple, 3-connected, CP parabolic proper plane network G with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry such that

$$\frac{\log \mathsf{UST}_G\left(\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{past}_T(e)) \geq R\right)}{\log(R)}$$

does not converge as $R \to \infty$ for some edge e of G. The details are left to the reader.

Similar constructions show that the behaviour of $\mathsf{WUSF}_G(\mathrm{diam}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathrm{past}_{\mathfrak{F}}(e)) \geq R \cdot r_{\mathbb{H}}(x))$ is not universal over simple, 3-connected, CP hyperbolic proper plane network G with bounded codegrees and bounded local geometry in the regime that $r_{\mathbb{H}}(x)$ is small.

6.2 Open Problems

It is natural to ask to what extent the assumption of planarity in Theorem 1.1 can be relaxed. Part (1) of the following question was suggested by R. Lyons.

Question 6.2. *Let G be a bounded degree proper plane graph.*

(1) Let H be a finite graph. Is the free uniform spanning forest of the product graph $G \times H$ connected almost surely?

(2) Let G' be a bounded degree graph that is rough isometric to G. Is the the free uniform spanning forest of G connected almost surely?

Without the assumption of planarity, connectivity of the FUSF is not preserved by rough isometries; this can be seen from an analysis of the graphs appearing in [10, Theorem 3.5].

Conjecture 6.3 (Connectivity of the FUSF is a property of the carrier)**.** *Let D be a domain. Then either every simple, bounded degree triangulation admitting a circle packing in D has an almost surely connected free uniform spanning forest, or every simple, bounded degree triangulation admitting a circle packing in D has an almost surely disconnected free uniform spanning forest.*

Theorem 1.8 implies that Conjecture 6.3 holds when D is countably connected. The results of [20] imply that the transience or recurrence of the random walk is a property of the carrier, and in particular that Conjecture 6.3 holds when D is the complement of a polar set. However, we do not know of a domain such that every simple, bounded degree triangulation admitting a circle packing in D has an a.s. disconnected FUSF. The following candidate for such an example is suggested by the example of Theorem 1.7.

Question 6.4. *Let T be a bounded degree triangulation that admits a circle packing in the complement of a positive-length Cantor set. Is the free uniform spanning forest of T disconnected almost surely?*

Acknowledgements

TH thanks Tel Aviv University and both authors thank the Issac Newton Institute, where part of this work was carried out, for their hospitality. We thank Gady Kozma for useful discussions and for collaborating with us on the analysis of the example in Section 5.5. We also thank Tyler Helmuth for his careful reading of an earlier version of this manuscript. Images of circle packings were created with Ken Stephenson's CirclePack software [56].

This project was supported by NSERC Discovery grant 418203, ISF grant 1207/15, and ERC starting grant 676970.

References

[1] D. Aharonov, *The sharp constant in the ring lemma*, Complex Variables Theory Appl. **33** (1997), no. 1-4, 27–31. MR1624890 (99c:30008)

[2] D. Aldous and R. Lyons, *Processes on unimodular random networks*, Electron. J. Probab. **12** (2007), no. 54, 1454–1508. MR2354165 (2008m:60012)
[3] J. Anderson, *Hyperbolic geometry*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
[4] O. Angel, M. T Barlow, O. Gurel-Gurevich, and A. Nachmias, *Boundaries of planar graphs, via circle packings*, Ann. Probab. (2013). to appear.
[5] O. Angel, T. Hutchcroft, A. Nachmias, and G. Ray, *Unimodular hyperbolic triangulations: Circle packing and random walk*, Invent. Math. to appear.
[6] O. Angel and G. Ray, *The half plane uipt is recurrent*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.00410 (2016).
[7] M. T Barlow, *Loop erased walks and uniform spanning trees*, Preprint, available at http://www. math. ubc. ca/˜ barlow/preprints/106 ust survey. pdf (2014).
[8] M. T Barlow and R. Masson, *Spectral dimension and random walks on the two dimensional uniform spanning tree*, Communications in mathematical physics **305** (2011), no. 1, 23–57.
[9] I. Benjamini, R. Lyons, Y. Peres, and O. Schramm, *Uniform spanning forests*, Ann. Probab. **29** (2001), no. 1, 1–65. MR1825141 (2003a:60015)
[10] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm, *Harmonic functions on planar and almost planar graphs and manifolds, via circle packings*, Invent. Math. **126** (1996), no. 3, 565–587. MR1419007 (97k:31009)
[11] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm, *Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs*, Electron. J. Probab. **6** (2001), no. 23, 1–13.
[12] S. Bhupatiraju, J. Hanson, and A. A Járai, *Inequalities for critical exponents in d-dimensional sandpiles*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06475 (2016).
[13] G. R. Brightwell and E. R. Scheinerman, *Representations of planar graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **6** (1993), no. 2, 214–229. MR1215229 (95d:05043)
[14] R. Burton and R. Pemantle, *Local characteristics, entropy and limit theorems for spanning trees and domino tilings via transfer-impedances*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 3, 1329–1371. MR1235419 (94m:60019)
[15] D. Chelkak et al., *Robust discrete complex analysis: A toolbox*, The Annals of Probability **44** (2016), no. 1, 628–683.
[16] R. Diestel and D. Kühn, *Graph-theoretical versus topological ends of graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **87** (2003), no. 1, 197–206. Dedicated to Crispin St. J. A. Nash-Williams. MR1967888 (2004d:05196)
[17] R. Diestel and D. Kühn, *Topological paths, cycles and spanning trees in infinite graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **25** (2004), no. 6, 835–862.
[18] C. Garban, *Quantum gravity and the kpz formula [after duplantier-sheffield]*, Astérisque **352** (2013), 315–354.
[19] O. Gurel-Gurevich and A. Nachmias, *Recurrence of planar graph limits*, Ann. of Math. (2) **177** (2013), no. 2, 761–781. MR3010812
[20] O. Gurel-Gurevich, A. Nachmias, and J. Souto, *Recurrence of multiply-ended planar triangulations.* http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.00221.
[21] O. Häggström, *Random-cluster measures and uniform spanning trees*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **59** (1995), no. 2, 267–275. MR1357655 (97b:60170)
[22] L. J. Hansen, *On the Rodin and Sullivan ring lemma*, Complex Variables Theory Appl. **10** (1988), no. 1, 23–30. MR946096 (90e:30008)
[23] Z.-X. He, *Rigidity of infinite disk patterns*, Annals of Mathematics **149** (1999), 1–33.
[24] Z.-X. He and O. Schramm, *Hyperbolic and parabolic packings*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **14** (1995), no. 2, 123–149. MR1331923 (96h:52017)
[25] Z.-X. He and O. Schramm, *Fixed points, Koebe uniformization and circle packings*, Ann. of Math. (2) **137** (1993), no. 2, 369–406. MR1207210 (96b:30015)
[26] Z.-X. He and O. Schramm, *The c-convergence of hexagonal disk packings to the riemann map*, Acta Mathematica **180** (1998), no. 2, 219–245 (English).
[27] T. Hutchcroft, *Wired cycle-breaking dynamics for uniform spanning forests*, Ann. Probab. to appear.
[28] T. Hutchcroft, *Interlacements and the wired uniform spanning forest*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.08509 (2015).
[29] T. Hutchcroft and Y. Peres, *Boundaries of planar graphs: A unified approach*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.03923 (2015).

[30] P. T. Johnstone, *Notes on logic and set theory*, Cambridge Mathematical Textbooks, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. MR923115 (89e:03003)
[31] J. Jonasson and O. Schramm, *On the cover time of planar graphs*, Electron. Comm. Probab. **5** (2000), 85–90 (electronic). MR1781842 (2001g:60170)
[32] R. Kenyon, *The asymptotic determinant of the discrete laplacian*, Acta Mathematica **185** (2000), no. 2, 239–286.
[33] G. Kirchhoff, *Ueber die auflösung der gleichungen, auf welche man bei der untersuchung der linearen vertheilung galvanischer ströme geführt wird*, Annalen der Physik **148** (1847), no. 12, 497–508.
[34] P. Koebe, *Kontaktprobleme der konformen abbildung*, Hirzel, 1936.
[35] G. F. Lawler, *Loop-erased self-avoiding random walk and the Laplacian random walk*, J. Phys. A **20** (1987), no. 13, 4565–4568. MR914293 (89a:82007)
[36] G. F Lawler, *Conformally invariant processes in the plane*, American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
[37] G. F Lawler et al., *A self-avoiding random walk*, Duke Mathematical Journal **47** (1980), no. 3, 655–693.
[38] G. F Lawler, O. Schramm, and W. Werner, *Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees*, Annals of probability: An official journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics **32** (2004), no. 1, 939–995.
[39] J. Lyklema, C Evertsz, and L Pietronero, *The laplacian random walk*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **2** (1986), no. 2, 77.
[40] R. Lyons and Y. Peres, *Probability on trees and networks*, Cambridge University Press, 2015. In preparation. Current version available at `http://mypage.iu.edu/~rdlyons/`.
[41] R. Lyons, *Random complexes and l^2-Betti numbers*, J. Topol. Anal. **1** (2009), no. 2, 153–175. MR2541759 (2010k:05130)
[42] R. Lyons, B. J. Morris, and O. Schramm, *Ends in uniform spanning forests*, Electron. J. Probab. **13** (2008), no. 58, 1702–1725. MR2448128 (2010a:60031)
[43] A. Marden and B. Rodin, *On thurston's formulation and proof of andreev's theorem*, Computational methods and function theory, 1990, pp. 103–115.
[44] R. Masson, *The growth exponent for planar loop-erased random walk*, University of Chicago, Department of Mathematics, 2008.
[45] R. L. Moore, *Concerning upper semi-continuous collections of continua*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (1925), no. 4, 416–428. MR1501320
[46] B. Morris, *The components of the wired spanning forest are recurrent*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **125** (2003), no. 2, 259–265. MR1961344 (2004a:60024)
[47] R. Pemantle, *Choosing a spanning tree for the integer lattice uniformly*, Ann. Probab. **19** (1991), no. 4, 1559–1574. MR1127715 (92g:60014)
[48] Y. Peres, *Probability on trees: an introductory climb*, Lectures on probability theory and statistics, 1999, pp. 193–280.
[49] B. Rodin and D. Sullivan, *The convergence of circle packings to the Riemann mapping*, J. Differential Geom. **26** (1987), no. 2, 349–360. MR906396 (90c:30007)
[50] S. Rohde, *Oded Schramm: From Circle Packing to SLE*, Ann. Probab. **39** (2011), 1621–1667.
[51] O. Schramm, *Transboundary extremal length*, J. Anal. Math. **66** (1995), 307–329. MR1370355 (96k:30009)
[52] O. Schramm, *Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees*, Israel J. Math. **118** (2000), 221–288.
[53] D. Shiraishi, *Growth exponent for loop-erased random walk in three dimensions.*
[54] R. Siders, *Layered circlepackings and the type problem*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **126** (1998), no. 10, 3071–3074.
[55] R. Solomyak, *Essential spanning forests and electrical networks on groups*, J. Theoret. Probab. **12** (1999), no. 2, 523–548. MR1684756 (2000f:31013)
[56] K. Stephenson, *Circle pack, java 2.0.*
[57] K. Stephenson, *Introduction to circle packing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005. The theory of discrete analytic functions. MR2131318 (2006a:52022)

[58] W. P. Thurston, *The geometry and topology of 3-manifolds*, Princeton lecture notes. (Unknown Month 1978).

[59] D. B. Wilson, *Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time*, Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (Philadelphia, PA, 1996), 1996, pp. 296–303. MR1427525

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia
E-mail address: thutch@math.ubc.ca

School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University
E-mail address: asafnach@post.tau.ac.il